arXiv:1602.02897v1 [math.CA] 9 Feb 2016

SCATTERING PARABOLIC SOLUTIONS FOR THE SPATIAL N-CENTRE PROBLEM

ALBERTO BOSCAGGIN, WALTER DAMBROSIO AND SUSANNA TERRACINI

ABSTRACT. For the N-centre problem in the three dimensional space,

$$\ddot{x} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{m_i\,(x-c_i)}{|x-c_i|^{\alpha+2}}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{c_1,\dots,c_N\},$$

where $N \geq 2$, $m_i > 0$ and $\alpha \in [1,2)$, we prove the existence of entire parabolic trajectories having prescribed asymptotic directions. The proof relies on a variational argument of min-max type. Morse index estimates and regularization techniques are used in order to rule out the possible occurrence of collisions.

1. Introduction and statement of the main result

The N-centre problem is a simplified version of the restricted circular $N+1$-body problem in a rotating frame, where the centrifugal force is neglected; it concerns the motion of a point mass moving under the attraction due to N fixed centers of force $c_1,\dots,c_N$. In this paper we shall be concerned with homogeneous potential of degree $-\alpha$, with $\alpha \in [1,2)$, thus including the newtonian gravitational case ($\alpha = 1$), in the *three dimensional space*. So the motion equation takes the form

$$\ddot{x} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{m_i\,(x-c_i)}{|x-c_i|^{\alpha+2}}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{c_1,\dots,c_N\}, \tag{1}$$

where $N \geq 2$, $m_i > 0$, $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ (with $c_i \neq c_j$ for $i \neq j$) and the associated Hamiltonian is

$$H(p,x) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{m_i}{\alpha |x-c_i|^{\alpha}}\,.$$

Our aim is to prove the existence of unbounded non-collision entire trajectories having zero energy (i.e., *parabolic trajectories*) and prescribed ingoing and outgoing directions. In spite of their natural structural instability, these orbits act as connections between different normalized configurations and can be used as *carriers from one to the other region of the phase space*; as such, they have been used as building blocks for constructing complex trajectories (see, e.g. [24]). In recent papers [3, 4, 32] the existence of parabolic trajectories has been considered for the

Date: February 10, 2016.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 7J45, 70B05, 70F16.

Key words and phrases. N-centre problem, Parabolic solutions, Morse index, Regularization of collisions.

Acknowlegments. The authors wish to thank Prof. Rafael Ortega for some useful discussions. Work partially supported by the ERC Advanced Grant 2013 n. 339958 *Complex Patterns for Strongly Interacting Dynamical Systems - COMPAT*, by the PRIN-2012-74FYK7 Grant *Variational and perturbative aspects of nonlinear differential problems*; A. Boscaggin and W. Dambrosio were also supported by the GNAMPA Project 2015 *Equazioni Differenziali Ordinarie sulla retta reale.*

anisotropic Kepler problem and for the N-body problem; more precisely, the presence of parabolic orbits and their variational character has been linked with the existence of minimal collision trajectories and eventually with the detection of unbounded families of non-collision periodic orbits [20, 22, 24]. Non-trivial parabolic orbits may be of interest also from the point of view of the applications of weak KAM theory in Celestial Mechanics; indeed, since they are homoclinic to the infinity, which represents the Aubry-Mather set of our system, they can be used to construct multiple viscosity solutions of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi equation (see also [21]).

We are going to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $\xi^+, \xi^- \in \mathbb{S}^2$ with $\xi^+ \neq \xi^-$, there exists a spatial parabolic solution $x : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{c_1, \dots, c_N\}$ of (1) such that*

$$|x(t)| \sim \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{2\alpha}}(2+\alpha)\right)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}} |t|^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}, \qquad t \to \pm\infty,$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \frac{x(t)}{|x(t)|} = \xi^{\pm}. \tag{2}$$

We remark that, when $\xi^+ = \xi^-$, we can still ensure the existence of a generalized spatial parabolic solutions of (1) satisfying (2) (for $\xi^+ = \xi^-$), having maybe some collisions with the set of the centers (see Remark 5.1). Let us now examine our Theorem in the contest of scattering: the *scattering angle* is that between the outgoing and incident directions. So Theorem 1.1 states the existence of at least one spatial trajectory having vanishing asymptotic velocity *for every scattering angle*. Let us stress that this is not the case for central $-\alpha$-homogeneous potentials: for the Newtonian potential $1/r$, it is a straightforward consequence of the preservation of the Runge-Lenz vector that the only allowed scattering angle is 2π. However, for potentials of the form $1/r^\alpha$ with $\alpha > 1$, the parabolic trajectories form a loop, as the scattering angle can be shown to be $2\pi/(2-\alpha) > 2\pi$ at zero energy (see Proposition 6.1). This picture is in striking contrast with the positive energy case, where, for hyperbolic trajectories, all (but one) scattering angles are always achieved. The presence of two or more centers results into the occurrence of parabolic connections between every pair of asymptotic configurations, thus allowing every value of the scattering angle, similarly with the hyperbolic case [13, 14].

In the planar N-centre problem, unbounded non-collision parabolic trajectories are known to exist in various homotopy classes of paths and the zero energy shell exhibits a symbolic dynamics (see e.g. [18]). Indeed, planar unbounded parabolic trajectories can be symbolically described by their topological properties. They are all local minimizers for the action and the Jacobi metric. In contrast, local action minimizing unbounded parabolic trajectories are not expected to exist in the three dimensional space. The ultimate reason rests in the properties of the scattering angle: very interestingly, the "looping" occurring for $\alpha \geq 1$ has been linked in [31] by K. Tanaka with a change in the Morse index of the parabolic solutions (see also [28, 29]). Similarly to the case of unbounded hyperbolic trajectories [13, 14] our solutions too will have a nontrivial Morse index, as it will result as a mountain pass variational argument: the absence of collisions will be related with the Morse index. Notice, however, that the case $\alpha = 1$ is particularly delicate and indeed it requires an additional analysis, based on regularization techniques (see [26]).

It is well known since the times of Euler (in 1760) that the planar two-centre problem can be integrated by using elliptic-hyperbolic coordinates (see e.g. [33]). The planar case of N-centre with $N \geq 3$ is known to be non integrable on non-negative energy levels and has positive entropy; some partial extensions are available also for the spatial case (see [5, 6, 7, 11, 18, 19]). Recently, in [24] Soave and Terracini have shown the presence of a chaotic subsystem for the planar N-centre problem also at negative energies. Let us finally mention that topologically nontrivial periodic trajectories have been recently investigated both in the planar and spatial N-body and the N-centre problems by means of constrained minimization arguments (see [8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 25]).

This paper is organized in five Sections and one Appendix. Section §2 is devoted to investigate the general properties of parabolic solutions. In Section §3 we show how to approximate entire solutions to 1, by considering the finite time interval auxiliary problem. In Section §4 we set up a min-max scheme and we show basic estimates for the critical values and the corresponding solutions, with attention to their Morse index. Finally, in Section §5 we study some properties of the approximate solutions in order to control their behavior at infinity and rule out the presence of collisions, completing the proof of our Theorem. The Appendix is devoted to a systematic study of parabolic arcs of the fully $-\alpha$-homogenous case and of their variational characterizations.

1.1. **Notation.** The symbols $x \cdot y$ and $|x|$ denote the standard Euclidean product and Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^3$, $B_\rho(x)$ is the open ball of radius ρ centered at x. The symbols $\langle u, v\rangle$ and $\|u\|$ stand for the usual scalar product and the associated norm on the Sobolev space $H^1([a,b];\mathbb{R}^3)$, namely

$$\langle u, v\rangle = \int_a^b \left(u(t)\cdot v(t) + \dot u(t)\cdot \dot v(t)\right)\, dt, \qquad \|u\| = \left[\int_a^b \left(|u(t)|^2 + |\dot u(t)|^2\right)\, dt\right]^{1/2}.$$

Finally, $\mathrm{j}(A)$ is the Morse-index of a self-adjoint bounded linear operator A on an Hilbert space.

1.2. **Technical estimates on the potential.** Let us define the collision set

$$\Sigma = \{c_1, \dots, c_N\}$$

and the potential

$$V(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{\alpha|x - c_i|^\alpha}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma. \tag{3}$$

Also, let

$$m = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i, \qquad \Xi = \max_i |c_i|. \tag{4}$$

Without loss of generality, we finally assume that the center of mass is placed at the origin, namely

$$\sum_{i=1}^N m_i c_i = 0. \tag{5}$$

Throughout the paper, both the behavior of V near the centers c_i and the behavior of V at infinity will play an important role. Hence, we fix here some useful notation.

As for the behavior of V near the singularities, for any $i = 1, \dots, N$ we write

$$V(x) = \frac{m_i}{\alpha |x - c_i|^\alpha} + \Phi_i(x). \tag{6}$$

Of course, $\Phi_i \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus (\Sigma \setminus \{c_i\}))$. From now on, we choose a constant $\delta^* > 0$ so small that

$$B_{\delta^*}(c_i) \subset B_{\Xi+1}(0), \ \forall\, i = 1, \dots, N, \qquad B_{\delta^*}(c_i) \cap B_{\delta^*}(c_j) = \emptyset, \ \forall\, i \neq j. \tag{7}$$

Moreover, we also assume

$$\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{m_i}{|x - c_i|^\alpha} + 2\Phi_i(c_i) + \nabla \Phi_i(x) \cdot (x - c_i) > 0, \quad \text{for } 0 < |x - c_i| \leq \delta^*, \tag{8}$$

and

$$V(x) \leq \frac{3 m_i}{2\alpha |x - c_i|^\alpha}, \quad \text{for } 0 < |x - c_i| \leq \delta^*, \tag{9}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

On the other hand, dealing with the behavior of V at infinity, we set

$$V(x) = \frac{m}{\alpha |x|^\alpha} + W(x). \tag{10}$$

Using (5), we can easily see that

$$W(x) = O\left(\frac{1}{|x|^{\alpha+2}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla W(x) = O\left(\frac{1}{|x|^{\alpha+3}}\right), \quad \text{for } |x| \to +\infty.$$

As a consequence, we can fix constants $C_-, C_+ > 0$ and $K > \Xi + 1$ such that

$$|W(x)| \leq \frac{C_+}{|x|^{\alpha+2}} \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla W(x)| \leq \frac{C_+}{|x|^{\alpha+3}}, \quad \text{for every } |x| \geq K, \tag{11}$$

$$2|W(x)| + |\nabla W(x) \cdot x| \leq \frac{(2-\alpha) m}{4\alpha} \frac{1}{|x|^\alpha}, \quad \text{for every } |x| \geq K, \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{C_-}{|x|^\alpha} \leq V(x) \leq \frac{C_+}{|x|^\alpha}, \quad \text{for every } |x| \geq K, \tag{13}$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{|x|^{\alpha/2}} - \frac{C_+}{|x|^{2+\alpha/2}} \leq \sqrt{V(x)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{|x|^{\alpha/2}} + \frac{C_+}{|x|^{2+\alpha/2}}, \quad \text{for every } |x| \geq K. \tag{14}$$

The estimates (11), (12) and (14) are rather obvious, while (14) follows from (11) using the elementary inequalities $1 - 2|s| \leq \sqrt{1+s} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} s$ (valid for $s \geq -1$).

2. Some general properties of parabolic solutions

In this section we collect some general properties valid for "large" parabolic solutions of (1). More precisely, we deal with solutions $x : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathbb{R}^3$ of (1), with $-\infty \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq +\infty$ (in the case $t_i \in \{\pm\infty\}$, we obviously mean that t_i is not included in the interval of definition of x), satisfying the zero-energy relation

$$\frac{1}{2} |\dot{x}(t)|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{\alpha |x(t) - c_i|^\alpha} = 0, \quad \text{for every } t \in I, \tag{15}$$

and

$$|x(t)| \geq K, \quad \text{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2], \tag{16}$$

where $K > \Xi+1$ is the constant fixed in Subsection 1.2. Due to this last assumption, we always write

$$x(t) = r(t)s(t) \tag{17}$$

with $r(t) = |x(t)| \geq K$ and $s(t) = \frac{x(t)}{|x(t)|} \in \mathbb{S}^2$. In these new coordinates, recalling the definition (3), the fact that x has zero energy reads as

$$\dot{r}^2 + r^2|\dot{s}|^2 = 2V(rs), \tag{18}$$

while the differential equation (1) becomes

$$\ddot{r} = r|\dot{s}|^2 + \nabla V(rs)\cdot s, \qquad r\ddot{s} = \nabla_{\mathbb{S}^2} V(rs) - r|\dot{s}|^2 s - 2\dot{r}\dot{s}, \tag{19}$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^2} V(rs) = \nabla V(rs) - (\nabla V(rs)\cdot s)s$.

As a first step, we define

$$I(t) = \frac{1}{2}|x(t)|^2 = \frac{1}{2}r^2(t), \quad \text{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2],$$

and we establish a Lagrange-Jacobi inequality.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $x : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a parabolic solution of (1) satisfying (16). Then*

$$\ddot{I}(t) \geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2\alpha r^\alpha(t)}, \quad \textit{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2]. \tag{20}$$

As a consequence, either r is strictly monotone on $[t_1, t_2]$ or there exists $t^* \in (t_1, t_2)$ such that r is strictly decreasing on $[t_1, t^*)$ and strictly increasing on $(t^*, t_2]$.

Proof. A simple computation, based on (18) and (19), shows that

$$\ddot{I}(t) = 2V(x(t)) + \nabla V(x(t))\cdot x(t), \quad \text{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2]. \tag{21}$$

Using (10), we thus find

$$\ddot{I}(t) = \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{\alpha r^\alpha(t)} + 2W(x) + \nabla W(x(t))\cdot x(t), \quad \text{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2],$$

and we conclude in view of (12). □

As a quite direct consequence of Lemma 2.1 we can also establish the following useful corollary, which will be used various times in the paper.

Corollary 2.2. *Let $x : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a parabolic solution of (1) satisfying (16) and assume that r is strictly monotone on the whole $[t_1, t_2]$. Then*

$$\frac{\left|r(t_2)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}\right|}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}} \leq t_2 - t_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{(2-\alpha)m}}\max\{r(t_2), r(t_1)\}^{1+\alpha/2}, \tag{22}$$

where $C_+ > 0$ is the constant fixed in Subsection 1.2.

Proof. We give the proof when r is strictly increasing (the other case being analogous). At first, notice that, in view of Lemma 2.1, $\dot{r}(t_1) \geq 0$ and $\dot{r}(t) > 0$ for $t \in (t_1, t_2]$. Using the fact that x has zero-energy and (13), we find

$$0 < \dot{r}(t) \leq \sqrt{2C_+}\, r(t)^{-\alpha/2}, \quad \text{for every } t \in (t_1, t_2].$$

Hence

$$t_2 - t_1 = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{\dot r(t)}{\dot r(t)}\, dt \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2C_+}} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{\dot r(t)}{r(t)^{-\alpha/2}}\, dt$$
$$= \frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}} \left(r(t_2)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2} \right),$$

thus proving the estimate from below. On the other hand, using (20) we find, for $t \in [t_1, t_2]$,

$$\dot I(t) \geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2\alpha} \int_{t_1}^{t} r^{-\alpha}(s)\, ds \geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2\alpha} \frac{t - t_1}{r^\alpha(t_2)}.$$

Integrating on $[t_1, t_2]$, we thus have

$$\frac{1}{2} r^2(t_2) = I(t_2) \geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{4\alpha} \frac{(t_2 - t_1)^2}{r^\alpha(t_2)},$$

giving the estimate from above. □

The next result gives an estimate for the angular momentum

$$A(t) = x(t) \wedge \dot x(t), \qquad \text{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2].$$

Notice that, in the coordinates (17),

$$|A(t)| = r^2(t) |\dot s(t)|. \tag{23}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let $x : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a parabolic solution of (1) satisfying (16). Then*

$$|\dot A(t)| \leq \frac{C_+}{r^{\alpha+2}(t)}, \qquad \textit{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2], \tag{24}$$

where $C_+ > 0$ is the constant fixed in Subsection 1.2.

Proof. Since

$$\dot A(t) = x(t) \wedge \nabla V(x(t)) = x(t) \wedge \nabla W(x(t)), \qquad \text{for every } t \in [t_1, t_2],$$

the conclusion follows from (11). □

Now we are in position to prove the main result of this section, giving asymptotic estimates for large parabolic solutions defined on the half-line $[t_1, +\infty)$. Of course, a symmetric result holds for solutions defined on $(-\infty, t_2]$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $x : [t_1, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a parabolic solution of (1) such that $|x(t)| \geq K$ for any $t \in [t_1, +\infty)$. Then*

$$r(t) \sim \gamma_{\alpha,m}\, t^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}, \qquad t \to +\infty, \tag{25}$$

where

$$\gamma_{\alpha,m} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{2\alpha}} (2+\alpha) \right)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}, \tag{26}$$

and there exists $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^2$ such that

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} s(t) = \xi.$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.1 we immediately deduce that $r(t) \to +\infty$ for $t \to +\infty$ (monotonically); from this fact together with Corollary 2.2 we infer the existence of $T_1 > t_1$ such that

$$r^{\alpha+2}(t) \geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2\alpha}(t-T_1)^2, \quad \text{for every } t > T_1. \tag{27}$$

Therefore $|\dot{A}|$ is integrable at infinity, so that

$$\limsup_{t\to+\infty} |A(t)| < \infty. \tag{28}$$

Now, we define the function

$$\Gamma(t) = r^\alpha(t)\dot{r}^2(t), \qquad t > T_1, \tag{29}$$

and we observe that, in view of (10), (18) and (23),

$$\Gamma(t) = \frac{2m}{\alpha} + r^\alpha(t)W(x(t)) - \frac{|A(t)|^2}{r^{2-\alpha}(t)}.$$

Using the fact that $r(t) \to \infty$ and (11) and (28), we thus obtain

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \Gamma(t) = \frac{2m}{\alpha}.$$

An application of de l'Hopital's rule (compare with the proof of [3, Theorem 7.7]) then yields (25).

As for s, we observe that, as a consequence of (23), (25) and (28), there exist $a_0 > 0$ and $T_2 > T_1$ such that

$$|\dot{s}(t)| \leq \frac{a_0}{t^{4/(\alpha+2)}}, \quad \text{for every } t > T_2.$$

Therefore $|\dot{s}|$ is integrable at infinity, implying that s admits a limit for $t \to +\infty$. □

We conclude this section with a further technical estimate, which will play an important role in the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $x : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be a parabolic solution of* (1) *satisfying* (16) *and assume that r is strictly increasing on the whole $[t_1, t_2]$. Then, for any τ_1, τ_2 with $t_1 < \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq t_2$,*

$$\int_{\tau_2}^{t_2} |\dot{s}(t)|\, dt \leq \frac{C_1\, r(\tau_1)^{1-\alpha/2} + \frac{C_2}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}}{C_3 \frac{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}{r(\tau_1)^{3(\alpha+2)/4}}} \frac{C_4}{r(\tau_2)^{(2-\alpha)/4}}, \tag{30}$$

where C_j $(j = 1, \dots, 4)$ are positive constants depending only on α, m and C_+.

Clearly, a symmetric result can be given when r is strictly decreasing on $[t_1, t_2]$.

Proof. At first, we observe that, using (20) and Corollary 2.2, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{I}(\tau_1) &\geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2\alpha} \int_{t_1}^{\tau_1} r^{-\alpha}(s)\, ds \geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2\alpha} \frac{\tau_1 - t_1}{r^\alpha(\tau_1)} \\ &\geq \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2\alpha} \frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}} \frac{1}{r^\alpha(\tau_1)} (r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Next, for any $t \geq \tau_1$ we define

$$X(t) = I(t)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{8}}\, \dot{I}(t)$$

and we claim that X is increasing on $[\tau_1, t_2]$. Indeed, observing that

$$\dot{I}^2(t) = 2I(t)\left(|\dot{x}(t)|^2 - r^2(t)|\dot{s}(t)|^2\right) = 4I(t)V(x(t)) - 4I^2(t)|\dot{s}(t)|^2,$$

and recalling (21), we find, for every $t \in [\tau_1, t_2]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot X(t) &= \frac{\alpha-2}{8} I(t)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{8}-1}\dot I^2(t) + I(t)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{8}}\ddot I(t)\\ &= I(t)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{8}}\left(\left(1+\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)V(x(t)) + \nabla V(x(t))\cdot x(t) + \left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) I(t)|\dot s(t)|^2\right)\\ &\geq I(t)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{8}}\left(\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\frac{m}{\alpha r(t)} + \left(1+\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)W(x(t)) + \nabla W(x(t))\cdot x(t)\right) > 0,\end{aligned}$$

in view of (12). As a consequence, recalling (31),

$$\begin{aligned}I(t)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{8}}\,\dot I(t) &\geq I(\tau_1)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{8}}\,\dot I(\tau_1)\\ &\geq \frac{C_3}{r(\tau_1)^{\frac{3\alpha+2}{4}}}\left(r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}\right), \quad \text{for every } t\in[\tau_1,t_2],\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_3 = \frac{(2-\alpha)m}{2^{(14-\alpha)/8}\alpha}\frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{C_+}}.$$

Summing up,

$$\dot I(t) \geq \frac{C_3}{r(\tau_1)^{\frac{3\alpha+2}{4}}}\left(r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}\right) I(t)^{\frac{2-\alpha}{8}}, \quad \text{for every } t\in[\tau_1,t_2]. \tag{32}$$

Now, we write (24) as

$$|\dot A(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2^{\frac{\alpha+2}{2}}}\frac{C_+}{I(t)^{1+\alpha/2}}, \quad \text{for every } t\in[\tau_1,t_2].$$

Recalling (31) and the fact that $\dot I$ is increasing, we find, for $t \in [\tau_1, t_2]$,

$$|\dot A(t)| \leq \frac{\alpha\left(1+\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)C_+\sqrt{2C_+}}{2^{\alpha/2}(2-\alpha)m}\frac{r^\alpha(\tau_1)}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2}-r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}\frac{\dot I(t)}{I(t)^{1+\alpha/2}},$$

so that

$$\int_{\tau_1}^t |\dot A(s)|\,ds \leq \frac{C_2}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2}-r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}, \quad \text{for every } t\in[\tau_1,t_2],$$

where

$$C_2 = \frac{2\left(1+\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)C_+\sqrt{2C_+}}{(2-\alpha)m}.$$

Therefore, using the energy relation and (13), for every $t \in [\tau_1, t_2]$,

$$\begin{aligned}|A(t)| &\leq |A(\tau_1)| + \frac{C_2}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2}-r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}\\ &\leq C_1 r(\tau_1)^{1-\alpha/2} + \frac{C_2}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2}-r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}},\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = \sqrt{2C_+}$ Recalling (23), we thus find

$$|\dot s(t)| \leq \left(C_1 r(\tau_1)^{1-\alpha/2} + \frac{C_2}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2}-r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}\right)\frac{1}{2I(t)}, \quad \text{for every } t\in[\tau_1,t_2].$$

Combining this estimate with (32), we obtain, for $\tau_2 \in [\tau_1, t_2]$,

$$\int_{\tau_2}^{t_2} |\dot{s}(t)|\, dt \leq \frac{C_1 r(\tau_1)^{1-\alpha/2} + \frac{C_2}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}}{C_3 \frac{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}{r(\tau_1)^{3(\alpha+2)/4}}} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tau_2}^{t_2} \frac{\dot{I}(t)}{I(t)^{1+(2-\alpha)/8}}\, dt$$
$$\leq \frac{C_1 r(\tau_1)^{1-\alpha/2} + \frac{C_2}{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}}{C_3 \frac{r(\tau_1)^{1+\alpha/2} - r(t_1)^{1+\alpha/2}}{r(\tau_1)^{3(\alpha+2)/4}}} \frac{C_4}{r(\tau_2)^{(2-\alpha)/4}},$$

where $C_4 = 2^{(\alpha+14)/8}/(2-\alpha)$. The proof is thus concluded. □

3. The approximation argument

In this section, given $\xi^+, \xi^- \in \mathbb{S}^2$, we present a result showing how an entire parabolic solution of (1) satisfying (2) can be obtained as limit of parabolic solutions defined on compact intervals, provided suitable assumptions are satisfied. Notice that in this section the hypothesis $\xi^+ \neq \xi^-$ is not needed.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\xi^+, \xi^- \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Suppose that, for every large $R > 0$, there exists a parabolic solution $x_R : [-\omega_R, \omega_R] \to \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma$ of (1) satisfying $x_R(-\omega_R) = R\xi^-$, $x_R(\omega_R) = R\xi^+$,*

$$\limsup_{R\to+\infty} \min_t |x_R(t)| < +\infty \tag{33}$$

and

$$\liminf_{R\to+\infty} \min_t |x_R(t) - c_i| > 0, \qquad \forall\, i = 1, \dots, N. \tag{34}$$

Finally, in the case $\min_t |x_R(t)| < K$, suppose further that

$$\limsup_{R\to+\infty} \left(t_R^+ - t_R^-\right) < +\infty, \tag{35}$$

being $K > \Xi + 1$ the constant fixed in Subsection 1.2 and $t_R^- < t_R^+$ the unique instants such that $|x_R(t_R^\pm)| = K$ and $|x_R(t)| > K$ for $t < t_R^-$ and $t > t_R^+$.

Then, there exists a parabolic solution $x_\infty : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma$ of (1) such that, writing $x_\infty = r_\infty s_\infty$ as in (17),

$$r_\infty(t) \sim \gamma_{\alpha,m} |t|^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}, \qquad t \to \pm\infty,$$

with $\gamma_{\alpha,m}$ given by (26), and

$$\lim_{t\to\pm\infty} s_\infty(t) = \xi^\pm.$$

Proof. As a preliminary step, we notice that, for any R such that $\min_t |x_R(t)| \geq K$ (if any), Lemma 2.1 implies that $r_R(t) := |x_R(t)|$ has a unique minimum point t_R; in this case, we set $t_R^- = t_R^+ = t_R$. Hence, the instants $t_R^\pm$ are well-defined for any R. We also introduce the constants $K_R = \min_t r_R(t)$ and $\tilde{K}_R = \max\{K, K_R\}$ and we observe that assumption (33) guarantees the existence of $\tilde{K} \geq K$ such that $\tilde{K}_R \leq \tilde{K}$ for any (large) R. We split the proof in some steps.

Claim 1: it holds that $\omega_R - t_R^+ \to +\infty$ and $-\omega_R - t_R^- \to -\infty$.

Indeed, using Corollary 2.2 with $t_1 = t_R^+$ and $t_2 = \omega_R$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_R - t_R^+ &\geq \frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}}\left(R^{1+\alpha/2} - \tilde{K}_R^{1+\alpha/2}\right)\\ &\geq \frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}}\left(R^{1+\alpha/2} - \tilde{K}^{1+\alpha/2}\right),\end{aligned}$$

whence the conclusion (for $-\omega_R - t_R^-$ the argument is the same).

We now define

$$\tilde{x}_R(t) = x_R\left(t + \frac{t_R^- + t_R^+}{2}\right), \qquad t \in [\omega_R^-, \omega_R^+], \tag{36}$$

where

$$\omega_R^- = -\omega_R - t_R^- - \Delta_R, \quad \omega_R^+ = \omega_R - t_R^+ + \Delta_R, \quad \Delta_R = \frac{t_R^+ - t_R^-}{2}.$$

Notice that assumption (35) guarantees that $\Delta_R \leq \Delta$ for a suitable $\Delta > 0$ and R large enough. Then, we have the following.

Claim 2: there exists a $\mathcal{C}^2$-function $x_\infty : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ such that, for $R \to +\infty$,

$$\tilde{x}_R \to x_\infty \quad \text{ in } \mathcal{C}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Indeed, (33) and (34) imply that

$$|\tilde{x}_R(0)|, \quad |\dot{\tilde{x}}_R(0)| = \sqrt{2V(\tilde{x}_R(0))}, \quad \max_t |\ddot{\tilde{x}}_R(t)| = \max_t |\nabla V(\tilde{x}_R(t))|$$

are bounded in R. Then, a standard compactness argument gives the conclusion.

Claim 3: $x_\infty : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma$ is a parabolic solution of (1) and

$$r_\infty(t) \sim \gamma_{\alpha,m},\, |t|^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}} \qquad t \to \pm\infty.$$

Indeed, (34) guarantees that x_∞ has no collisions; hence, using Claim 2 we can pass to the limit both in the equation and in the energy relation, thus ensuring that x_∞ is a parabolic solution of (1). Moreover, (35) implies that $r_\infty(t) \geq K$ for $|t| \geq \Delta$. Then, the asymptotic estimates for r_∞ follow from Proposition 2.4 (and the symmetric statement for $t \to -\infty$). Notice that Proposition 2.4 also implies that s_∞ admits a limit both for $t \to +\infty$ and for $t \to -\infty$, but we do not know these limits to be $\xi^\pm$. This is indeed our final step.

Claim 4: it holds that

$$\lim_{t \to \pm\infty} s_\infty(t) = \xi^\pm. \tag{37}$$

We prove only the limit relation for $t \to +\infty$ (the other being analogous). As a first step, we fix a constant $\tilde{C}$ such that

$$\frac{C_1(\tilde{K}_R+1)^{1-\alpha/2} + \frac{C_2}{(\tilde{K}_R+1)^{1+\alpha/2} - \tilde{K}_R^{1+\alpha/2}}}{C_3 \frac{(\tilde{K}_R+1)^{1+\alpha/2} - \tilde{K}_R^{1+\alpha/2}}{(\tilde{K}_R+1)^{3(\alpha+2)/4}}} C_4 < \tilde{C}$$

for any R (where the constants C_1, C_2, C_3 and C_4 are the ones in Lemma 2.5); this is possible since $K \leq \tilde{K}_R \leq \tilde{K}$. Next, for any $\epsilon > 0$ let us take $Z_\epsilon > \tilde{K} + 1$ such that

$$\frac{\tilde{C}}{Z_\epsilon^{(2-\alpha)/4}} < \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

so that

$$\frac{C_1(\tilde K_R+1)^{1-\alpha/2}+\frac{C_2}{(\tilde K_R+1)^{1+\alpha/2}-\tilde K_R^{1+\alpha/2}}}{C_3\frac{(\tilde K_R+1)^{1+\alpha/2}-\tilde K_R^{1+\alpha/2}}{(\tilde K_R+1)^{3(\alpha+2)/4}}}\frac{C_4}{Z_\epsilon^{(2-\alpha)/4}}<\frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

for any $R>Z_\epsilon$. Let $\tilde t_{\epsilon,R}>\Delta'_R>\Delta_R$ be the unique instants such that $\tilde r_R(\tilde t_{\epsilon,R})=Z_\epsilon$ and $\tilde r_R(\Delta'_R)=\tilde K_R+1$ respectively, where we have employed the usual notation $\tilde x_R=\tilde r_R\tilde s_R$. From Lemma 2.5 with the choices $t_1=\Delta_R$, $\tau_1=\Delta'_R$, $\tau_2=\tilde t_{\epsilon,R}$ and $t_2=\omega_R^+$, we have that

$$\int_{\tilde t_{\epsilon,R}}^{\omega_R^+}|\dot{\tilde s}_R(t)|\,dt<\frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

On the other hand, (22) gives

$$\tilde t_{\epsilon,R}-\Delta_R\le\sqrt{\frac{2\alpha}{(2-\alpha)m}}Z_\epsilon^{1+\alpha/2};$$

hence, recalling that $\Delta_R\le\Delta$,

$$\tilde t_\epsilon:=\sup_{R>Z_\epsilon}\tilde t_{\epsilon,R}<+\infty.$$

We are now in position to conclude. Indeed, for any $t>\tilde t_\epsilon$ let us take $R>Z_\epsilon$ such that $|\tilde s_R(t)-s_\infty(t)|<\epsilon/2$ (following from the $\mathcal{C}^2_{\rm loc}$ convergence). Then

$$\begin{aligned}|s_\infty(t)-\xi^+|&\le|s_\infty(t)-\tilde s_R(t)|+|\tilde s_R(t)-\tilde s_R(\omega_R^+)|\\&<\frac{\epsilon}{2}+\int_t^{\omega_R^+}|\dot{\tilde s}_R(t)|\,dt\le\frac{\epsilon}{2}+\int_{\tilde t_{\epsilon,R}}^{\omega_R^+}|\dot{\tilde s}_R(t)|<\frac{\epsilon}{2}+\frac{\epsilon}{2}=\epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

thus proving (37). □

4. The fixed-endpoints problem

In view of Proposition 3.1, in this section we look for parabolic solutions of the (free-time) fixed-endpoints problem

$$\begin{cases}\ddot x_R=\nabla V(x_R)\\ x_R(\pm\omega_R)=R\xi^\pm,\end{cases}\tag{38}$$

with V defined in (3). Henceforth, we use the notation

$$\mathcal{A}_{[a,b]}(x)=\int_a^b\left(\frac{1}{2}|\dot x(t)|^2+V(x(t))\right)dt$$

for any $x\in H^1([a,b];\mathbb{R}^3)$. As well known, if $\bar x:[a,b]\to\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Sigma$ is a (non-collision) solution of $\ddot x=\nabla V(x)$, then $\bar x$ is a critical point of the functional $\mathcal{A}_{[a,b]}$ on the domain $\{x\in H^1([a,b];\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Sigma)\,:\,x(a)=\bar x(a),\,x(b)=\bar x(b)\}$.

We have the following result, which can be considered of independent interest.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $K>\Xi+1$ be the constant given in Subsection 1.2. Then, for any $R>K$ and for any ξ^+, $\xi^-\in\mathbb{S}^2$ with $\xi^+\neq\xi^-$, there exist $\omega_R>0$ and a parabolic solution of* (38) *satisfying*

$$\mathrm{j}(d^2\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R))\le1,\tag{39}$$

and

$$\left(\sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}\right)R^{1-\alpha/2}-M\le\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R)\le\left(\sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}\right)R^{1-\alpha/2}+M, \tag{40}$$

where $M>0$ is a suitable constant not depending on R.

A comment about this result is in order. The existence of a parabolic solution of the fixed-endpoints problem is far from being surprising, since it could be proved by using quite standard minimization arguments (together with Marchal's principle [23]). In this way, a solution having zero Morse index (cf. (39)) can be obtained. Unfortunately, this solution is not robust when the fixed ends are sent to infinity. The crucial point in Theorem 4.1 is the asymptotic level estimate (40), which indeed does not hold for minimizing parabolic solutions. This estimate, together with the Morse index bound (39), will allow us to pass to the limit as the endpoints tend to infinity along the fixed directions. Indeed it enables us to prove (33), (34) and (35) (see Section 5); via Proposition 3.1, an entire parabolic solution of (1) with prescribed asymptotic directions will be therefore obtained.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 will be given in four main steps.

At first (see Section 4.1), we use a variational argument of min-max type to prove the existence of a parabolic solution for a modified equation of the form $\ddot{x}=\nabla V_\beta(x)$, with $\beta\in(0,1]$ and V_β a potential satisfying a strong-force condition near each center. The min-max argument is similar to the one introduced in [2, 17] dealing with the fixed-time (periodic) problem; here we look for fixed-energy solutions, therefore using the Maupertuis functional (as in [13, 29]).

As a second step (see Section 4.2), we pass to the limit for $\beta\to0^+$ so as to find the existence of a *generalized* (parabolic) solution of $\ddot{x}=\nabla V(x)$ (cf. [2, 29] again).

In the third step (see Section 4.3), we prove that generalized solutions are actually classical ones, by showing that collisions with the set of the centers cannot occur. To this end, we take advantage of a blow-up argument introduced in [31] and highlighting the relation between the Morse index of the solution and the number of its collisions. This is enough to obtain the conclusion when $\alpha>1$, while further information coming from regularizations techniques [26] is needed when $\alpha=1$.

Finally (see Section 4.4), we prove the Morse index formula (39) as well as the level estimate (40).

The arguments in the first two steps, as well as in the third step for $\alpha>1$, are valid more in general for parabolic solutions joining two points $q^+,q^-\in\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Sigma$ with $q^+\neq q^-$. For this reason, and not to overload the notation emphasizing an inessential dependence on R, we will give the corresponding proofs in this setting.

4.1. **A min-max argument.** Let us first define the modified potential V_β, for $\beta\in[0,1]$, by setting

$$V_\beta(x)=V(x)+\beta U(x),\qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Sigma,$$

where $U\in\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Sigma)$ is defined as

$$U(x)=\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{m_i}{2|x-c_i|^2}\Psi(|x-c_i|^2),$$

with $\Psi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^+;[0,1])$ a cut-off function such that $\Psi(r)=1$ if $0\le r\le \delta^*$ and $\Psi(r)=0$ if $r\ge 2\delta^*$. At this point, we can introduce the Maupertuis functional

$$\mathcal{M}_\beta(u)=\int_{-1}^1 |\dot u(t)|^2\,dt\int_{-1}^1 V_\beta(u(t))\,dt$$

defined on the Hilbert manifold

$$\Gamma=\Gamma_{q^\pm}=\Big\{u\in H^1([-1,1];\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Sigma)\,:\,u(\pm1)=q^\pm\Big\}.$$

As well-known (see, for instance, [1, Theorem 4.1] and [25, Appendix B]) $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ is smooth and any critical point $u_\beta\in\Gamma$ satisfies, for $t\in[-1,1]$,

$$\ddot u_\beta(t)=\omega_\beta^2\,\nabla V_\beta(u_\beta(t)),\qquad \frac12|\dot u_\beta(t)|^2-\omega_\beta^2\,V_\beta(u_\beta(t))=0, \tag{41}$$

where

$$\omega_\beta=\left(\frac{\int_{-1}^1|\dot u_\beta|^2}{2\int_{-1}^1 V_\beta(u_\beta)}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{42}$$

Notice that, since $q^+\neq q^-$, u_β is not constant: as a consequence, $\omega_\beta>0$ and the function

$$x_\beta(t)=u_\beta\left(\frac{t}{\omega_\beta}\right),\qquad t\in[-\omega_\beta,\omega_\beta], \tag{43}$$

is a parabolic solution of $\ddot x_\beta=\nabla V_\beta(x_\beta)$ on the interval $[-\omega_\beta,\omega_\beta]$ and, of course, $x_\beta(\pm\omega_\beta)=q^\pm$.

In the next lemma we collect the compactness properties of $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ which will be used later.

Lemma 4.2. *The following hold true:*

(M1) *for any $\beta\ge0$, $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ is coercive at infinity, that is, if $\|u_n\|\to+\infty$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n)=+\infty;$$

(M2) *for any $\beta>0$, $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ is "coercive at the boundary", that is, if $u\in\partial\Gamma$ and $u_n\rightharpoonup u$ weakly in H^1, then*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n)=+\infty;$$

(M3) *for any $\beta>0$, $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, that is, if $\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n)$ is bounded and $\nabla\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n)\to0$, then there exists $u\in\Gamma$ such that $u_n\to u$ strongly in H^1 (up to subsequences).*

Proof. As for (M1), we argue similarly as in [3, Lemma 3.2]. Suppose by contradiction that $\|u_n\|\to\infty$ and $\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n)$ is bounded from above. Then $\int_{-1}^1|\dot u_n|^2\to+\infty$ and, therefore,

$$\delta_n:=\int_{-1}^1 V_\beta(u_n)\to0^+.$$

As a consequence, there exists $t_n\in[0,1]$ such that $V_\beta(u_n(t_n))\le\delta_n$; hence $|u_n(t_n)|\to+\infty$. From (13), we thus

$$|u_n(t_n)|\ge\left(\frac{C_-}{\delta_n}\right)^{1/\alpha}.$$

Then, for large n, we have

$$\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_n|^2 \geq \int_{-1}^{t_n} |\dot{u}_n|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}|u_n(t_n) - q^-|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(C_-^{1/\alpha}\delta_n^{-1/\alpha} - |q^-|)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}C_-^{2/\alpha}\delta_n^{-2/\alpha};$$

as a consequence

$$\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n) \geq \frac{1}{4}C_-^{2/\alpha}\delta_n^{1-\frac{2}{\alpha}}$$

contradicting the fact that $\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n)$ is bounded for above.

As for (M2), we first observe that

$$\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}\big(|q^+| - |q^-|\big)^2 \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_n);$$

hence, we only need to show that $\int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_n) \to \infty$. This can be proved as in [1, Lemma 5.3] with obvious modifications.

Finally, we deal with (M3). Let $(u_n) \subset \Gamma$ be a Palais-Smale sequence. From (M1) we know that $\|u_n\|$ is bounded, so that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in H^1; moreover, $u \in \Gamma$ in view of (M2). Hence, we only need to show that $u_n \to u$ strongly. To this end, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n), u_n - u\rangle =& 2\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_n|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_n) - 2\int_{-1}^{1} (\dot{u}_n \cdot \dot{u}) \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_n) + \\ & \int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_n|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} \big(\nabla V_\beta(u_n) \cdot (u_n - u)\big)\end{aligned}$$

Since $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in H^1 and $u_n \to u$ uniformly in $[-1,1]$, with $u \in \Gamma$, it holds that

$$2\int_{-1}^{1} (\dot{u}_n \cdot \dot{u}) \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_n) \to 2\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u)$$

and

$$\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_n|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} \big(\nabla V_\beta(u_n) \cdot (u_n - u)\big) \to 0.$$

Therefore, taking into account that $\langle \nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta(u_n), u_n - u\rangle \to 0$ (notice that $u_n - u \in H_0^1([-1,1])$), we infer that

$$2\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_n|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_n) \to 2\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u).$$

Since $\int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_n) \to \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u)$, we thus have $\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_n|^2 \to \int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}|^2$. As a consequence, $u_n \to u$ strongly in H^1, as desired. □

Now we are going to describe the min-max argument. For any $h \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{S}^1, \Gamma\right)$ and for $i = 1, 2$, set

$$\tilde{h}_i : \mathbb{S}^1 \times [-1,1] \to \mathbb{S}^2, \qquad (s,t) \mapsto \frac{h(s)(t) - c_i}{|h(s)(t) - c_i|}.$$

Since $\tilde{h}_i(s, \pm 1) = q^\pm$ for any $s \in \mathbb{S}^1$, the map $\tilde{h}_i$ can be identified with a continuous self-map on $\mathbb{S}^2$ and so it has a well-defined degree $\deg_{\mathbb{S}^2}(\tilde{h}_i)$ [16]. We can thus define the class

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{q^\pm} = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{S}^1, \Gamma\right) \,:\, \deg_{\mathbb{S}^2}(\tilde{h}_1) \neq 0 = \deg_{\mathbb{S}^2}(\tilde{h}_2) \right\} \tag{44}$$

(it is clear that this set is non-empty) and the associated min-max value

$$c_\beta = c_{\beta,q^\pm} = \inf_{h\in\Lambda}\sup_{s\in\mathbb{S}^1}\mathcal{M}_\beta(h(s)). \tag{45}$$

We first show that the levels c_β are bounded and bounded away from zero.

Lemma 4.3. *There exist $c_*, c^* > 0$ such that*

$$c_* \le c_\beta \le c^*, \quad \text{for any } \beta\in[0,1].$$

Proof. We first observe that the function $\beta \mapsto c_\beta$ is non-decreasing. As a consequence, $c_0 \le c_\beta \le c_1$ for any $\beta\in[0,1]$. We thus only need to show that $c_0 > 0$. By contradiction, assume that there exist sequences $(h_n)\subset\Lambda$ and $(s_n)\subset\mathbb{S}^1$ such that $\mathcal{M}_0(h_n(s_n))\to 0$. Then

$$\int_{-1}^{1} V(h_n(s_n)) \le \frac{2\mathcal{M}_0(h_n(s_n))}{(|q^+|-|q^-|)^2}\to 0$$

and the very same arguments used in the proof of (M1) in Lemma 4.2 show that $\mathcal{M}_0(h_n(s_n))\to+\infty$, a contradiction. □

We are now in position to state and prove the main result of this subsection, ensuring the existence of critical points at level c_β and having Morse index at most 1.

Proposition 4.4. *For any $\beta>0$, c_β is a critical value for the functional $\mathcal{M}_\beta$. In particular, there exists $u_\beta = u_{\beta,q^\pm}\in\Gamma$ such that*

$$\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta)=c_\beta, \quad \nabla\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta)=0, \quad \mathrm{j}\left(d^2\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta)\right)\le 1.$$

Sketch of the proof. The fact that c_β is a critical value for $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ follows from standard arguments of Critical Point Theory. Indeed, the compactness properties of $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ collected in Lemma 4.2 allow us to prove a Deformation Lemma on the lines of [2, Proposition 1.17] or [29, Proposition 1.6]. Then, a well-known min-max principle (cf. [27, Theorem 4.2]) yields the conclusion.

To prove that $\mathcal{M}_\beta^{-1}(c_\beta)$ contains a critical point u_β with $\mathrm{j}\left(d^2\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta)\right)\le 1$, one has to argue similarly as in the proof of [29, Proposition 1.5 (iii)]. The crucial point here is that the Morse index cannot exceed the value 1 since, in the definition of c_β, the one-dimensional manifold $\mathbb{S}^1$ is involved (see also [31]). □

Remark 4.5. We observe that the results in this section could be proved also using different min-max classes, as for instance $\Lambda' = \left\{h\in\mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{S}^1,\Gamma\right) : \deg_{\mathbb{S}^2}(\tilde{h}_1)\neq 0\right\}$. The reason for the choice of the class Λ is that (as a direct consequence of the homotopy invariance of the degree) for any $h\in\Lambda$ there exists $s_h\in\mathbb{S}^1$ such that

$$h(s_h)([-1,1])\cap[c_1,c_2]\neq\emptyset, \tag{46}$$

where $[c_1,c_2]=\{\lambda c_1+(1-\lambda)c_2 : \lambda\in[0,1]\}$ is the segment joining c_1 and c_2. This property, which will play a crucial role in our next arguments (see the final part of Section 4.4), does not hold for min-max classes like Λ'.

4.2. **Generalized solutions.** Our goal now is to study the convergence for $\beta\to 0^+$ of the functions $u_\beta\in\Gamma$ given in Proposition 4.4. To this end, we state and prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *There exist $M_* > 0$ and ω_*, ω^* with $\omega_*, \omega^* > 0$ such that, for any $\beta \in (0,1]$,*

$$\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_\beta|^2 \le M_* \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_* \le \omega_\beta \le \omega^*$$

where ω_β is defined in (42).

Proof. The fact that $\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_\beta|^2$ is bounded follows immediately from (M1) of Lemma 4.2 together with Lemma 4.3: indeed, if $\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_\beta|^2 \to +\infty$ then $\|u_\beta\| \to +\infty$, so that

$$c^* \ge c_\beta = \mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta) \ge \mathcal{M}_0(u_\beta) \to +\infty,$$

a contradiction. As a consequence $\|u_\beta\|$ is bounded and we easily conclude that ω_β is bounded from above, as well. Finally, from Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\omega_\beta = \frac{\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_\beta|^2}{\sqrt{2c_\beta}} \ge \frac{(|q^+| - |q^-|)^2}{2\sqrt{2c_*}}$$

so that ω_β is bounded away from zero. This concludes the proof. □

From Lemma 4.6, it follows that (up to subsequences) $\omega_\beta \to \omega_0 \in [\omega_*, \omega^*]$ and $u_\beta \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in H^1. Moreover the set

$$D_0 = u_0^{-1}(\Sigma) \tag{47}$$

has zero measure; indeed, by Fatou's lemma and Lemma 4.3

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-1}^{1} V(u_0) &\le \liminf_{\beta\to 0^+} \int_{-1}^{1} V(u_\beta) \le \liminf_{\beta\to 0^+} \int_{-1}^{1} V_\beta(u_\beta) \\ &= \liminf_{\beta\to 0^+} \frac{c_\beta}{\int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}_\beta|^2} \le \frac{2c^*}{(|q^+| - |q^-|)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, arguing as in [29, p. 374], we can prove that the function

$$x_0(t) = u_0\left(\frac{t}{\omega_0}\right), \qquad t \in [-\omega_0, \omega_0], \tag{48}$$

is a generalized parabolic solution of $\ddot{x} = \nabla V(x)$, that is:

i) $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}([-\omega_0, \omega_0]; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $x_0(\pm\omega_0) = q^\pm$,
ii) the set $E_0 = x_0^{-1}(\Sigma) = \omega_0\, D_0$ has zero measure,
iii) $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}^2([-\omega_0, \omega_0] \setminus E_0; \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma)$ and, for any $t \in [-\omega_0, \omega_0] \setminus E_0$,

$$\ddot{x}_0(t) = \nabla V(x_0(t)), \qquad \frac{1}{2}|\dot{x}_0(t)|^2 - V(x_0(t)) = 0.$$

Of course, such a solution is actually a classical one whenever $D_0 = \emptyset$.

Remark 4.7. For further convenience, we also observe that, if $D_0 = \emptyset$, then $u_\beta \to u_0$ in $\mathcal{C}^2$, u_0 is is a critical point of $\mathcal{M}_0$ and, moreover,

$$\mathcal{M}_0(u_0) = c_0, \tag{49}$$

where c_0 is defined in (45) (for $\beta = 0$). To prove (49), we first observe that (as a consequence of the $\mathcal{C}^2$-convergence) $c_\beta = \mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta) \to \mathcal{M}_0(u_0)$; moreover, we have already noticed (see the proof of Lemma 4.3) that $\beta \mapsto c_\beta$ is non-decreasing. Hence, $c_0 \le \mathcal{M}_0(u_0)$. Now, assume by contraction that $c_0 < \mathcal{M}_0(u_0)$; then, there exists $h \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{S}^1, \Gamma)$ such that, for any $\beta \in (0,1]$,

$$\sup_{s\in\mathbb{S}^1} \mathcal{M}_0(h(s)) < \mathcal{M}_0(u_0) \le \mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta) = c_\beta \le \sup_{s\in\mathbb{S}^1} \mathcal{M}_\beta(h(s)).$$

On the other hand,

$$|\mathcal{M}_\beta(h(s)) - \mathcal{M}_0(h(s))| \le \beta \int_{-1}^{1} \left|\frac{d}{dt}h(s)\right|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} U(h(s)) \to 0,$$

uniformly in $s \in \mathbb{S}^1$ for $\beta \to 0^+$, a contradiction.

4.3. **Non-collision solutions.** In this section we show that $D_0 = \emptyset$. To this end, we assume by contradiction that $D_0 \neq \emptyset$ and we define

$$\nu = \#D_0 > 0. \tag{50}$$

We also set, for $\alpha \in [1, 2)$,

$$i(\alpha) = \max\left\{k \in \mathbb{N} \,:\, k < \frac{2}{2-\alpha}\right\}. \tag{51}$$

For comments about the meaning of this definition, we refer to [31, Section 4]. Here we simply notice that $i(1) = 1$ and $i(\alpha) > 1$ for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$.

The next proposition is analogous to [29, Proposition 4.1].

Lemma 4.8. *It holds that*

$$\liminf_{\beta\to 0^+} \mathrm{j}(d^2\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta)) \ge i(\alpha)\nu.$$

Sketch of the proof. The proof follows the same lines of the one of [29, Proposition 4.1], investigating the asymptotic behavior of the Morse indexes $\mathrm{j}(d^2\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta))$ for $\beta \to 0^+$ via a blow-up argument. The minor difference here comes from the proof of the convergence of the blow-up sequence and, for the reader's convenience, we sketch some details (similar arguments will also appear in the subsequent sections).

Let $\tau_0 \in D_0 \subset (-1, 1)$ and assume, to fix the ideas, $u_0(\tau_0) = c_1$. Then, using the fact that D_0 has zero measure, it is possible to find $\tau_\beta^-, \tau_\beta, \tau_\beta^+ \in (-1, 1)$ such that $\tau_\beta^- < \tau_\beta < \tau_\beta^+$, $\delta_\beta := |u_\beta(\tau_\beta) - c_1| = \min_t |u_\beta(t) - c_1| \to 0^+$,

$$|u_\beta(\tau_\beta^\pm) - c_1| = \delta^* \quad \text{and} \quad |u_\beta(t) - c_1| \le \delta^*, \quad \text{for any } t \in [\tau_\beta^-, \tau_\beta^+].$$

Since $u_\beta \to u_0$ uniformly, both $\tau_\beta - \tau_\beta^-$ and $\tau_\beta^+ - \tau_\beta$ are bounded away from zero. Let us define

$$d = \lim_{\beta\to 0^+} \frac{\beta}{\delta_\beta^{2-\alpha}};$$

we give the details only in the case $d < +\infty$ (for $d = +\infty$, see [29]). Let us consider x_β as defined in (43) and set

$$v_\beta(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_\beta}\left(x_\beta\left(\delta_\beta^{1+\alpha/2}t + \tau_\beta\,\omega_\beta\right) - c_1\right), \qquad t \in [-\gamma_\beta, \sigma_\beta],$$

where

$$-\gamma_\beta = \frac{\left(\tau_\beta^- - \tau_\beta\right)\omega_\beta}{\delta_\beta^{1+\alpha/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_\beta = \frac{\left(\tau_\beta^+ - \tau_\beta\right)\omega_\beta}{\delta_\beta^{1+\alpha/2}}.$$

Notice that $|v_\beta(0)| = 1$, $|v_\beta(t)| \ge 1$ and $|\delta_\beta v_\beta(t) + c_1| \le \delta^*$ for $t \in [-\gamma_\beta, \sigma_\beta]$. An easy computation shows that, writing V as in (6), v_β satisfies

$$\ddot{v}_\beta = -\frac{m_1 v_\beta}{|v_\beta|^{\alpha+2}} - \frac{\beta}{\delta_\beta^{2-\alpha}}\frac{m_1 v_\beta}{|v_\beta|^4} + \delta_\beta^{1+\alpha}\,\nabla\Phi_1(\delta_\beta v_\beta + c_1)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot v_\beta|^2 = \frac{m_1}{\alpha|v_\beta|^\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\beta}{\delta_\beta^{2-\alpha}}\frac{m_1}{|v_\beta|^2} + \delta_\beta^\alpha \Phi_1(\delta_\beta v_\beta + c_1).$$

Also, recalling that ω_β are bounded away from zero (see Lemma 4.6) we have that $-\gamma_\beta \to -\infty$ and $\sigma_\beta \to +\infty$. As a consequence, it is easy to see that $v_\beta \to v_0$ in $\mathcal{C}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, where v_0 satisfies

$$\ddot v_0 = -\frac{m_1 v_0}{|v_0|^{\alpha+2}} - d\,\frac{m_1 v_0}{|v_0|^4}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot v_0|^2 = \frac{m_1}{\alpha|v_0|^\alpha} + \frac{d}{2}\frac{m_1}{|v_0|^2}.$$

From now on, the proof follows exactly the one in [29]. □

In view of the above lemma, and recalling that $\mathrm{j}(d^2\mathcal{M}_\beta(u_\beta)) \le 1$ (see Proposition 4.4) we immediately see that $\nu = 0$ whenever $\alpha > 1$, contradicting (50). Hence, the proof that D_0 is empty is concluded in this case.

If $\alpha = 1$, Lemma 4.8 (again combined with Proposition 4.4) gives $\nu = 1$ and an additional argument is needed, requiring $|q^+| = |q^-| > K$. Let t_0 be the (unique) instant such that $x_0(t_0) \in \Sigma$ and, to fix the ideas, assume that $x_0(t_0) = c_1$. On one hand, arguing as in the proof of Theorem [31, Theorem 0.1], we can see that the limit

$$\lim_{t\to t_0} \frac{x_0(t) - c_1}{|x_0(t) - c_1|} = \xi_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2 \tag{52}$$

exists (that is, both the limits for $t \to t_0^\pm$ exist and they are equal). On the other hand, we can regularize the equation as described in [26]. More precisely, we set

$$\tau(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \frac{d\zeta}{|x_0(\zeta) - c_1|}, \qquad t \in [-\omega_0, \omega_0],$$

and we denote by $t(\tau)$ its inverse function, defined on the interval $[\tau^-, \tau^+]$ with $\tau^\pm = \int_{t_0}^{\pm\omega_0} d\zeta/|x_0(\zeta) - c_1|$; moreover, for any $\tau \neq 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} x(\tau) &= x_0(t(\tau)) - c_1 \\ y(\tau) &= \frac{d}{d\tau}x(\tau) \\ w(\tau) &= \frac{1}{|x(\tau)|}\left[\left(\frac{d}{d\tau}|x(\tau)|\right) y(\tau) - m_1 x(\tau)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the function $z(\tau) = (x(\tau), y(\tau), w(\tau))$ satisfies the differential equation

$$z'(\tau) = F(z(\tau)), \qquad \tau \neq 0$$

where $F = (F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty((\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma') \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\Sigma' = \{c_2 - c_1, \dots, c_N - c_1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(z) &= y \\ F_2(z) &= w + |x|^2 \nabla\Phi_1(x + c_1) \\ F_3(z) &= (x \cdot y)\nabla\Phi_1(x + c_1) + \big(2\Phi_1(x + c_1) + x \cdot \nabla\Phi_1(x + c_1)\big) y \end{aligned}$$

and Φ_1 given in (6). Using the estimates in [26, Section 7], it follows that the limit $z_0 := \lim_{\tau\to 0} z(\tau)$ exists with

$$z_0 = (0, 0, c_{m_1}\xi_0),$$

where c_{m_1} is a suitable non-zero constant depending only on m_1 and ξ_0 is as in (52). Hence, z satisfies the Cauchy problem

$$z' = F(z), \qquad z(0) = z_0$$

for any $\tau \in [\tau^-, \tau^+]$. Since F fulfills

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(x, -y, w) &= -F_1(x, y, w) \\ F_2(x, -y, w) &= F_2(x, y, w) \\ F_3(x, -y, w) &= -F_3(x, -y, w) \end{aligned}$$

for any $(x, y, w) \in (\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Sigma') \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$, it is immediate to see that x satisfies

$$x(\tau) = x(-\tau), \quad \text{for } |\tau| \leq \min\{-\tau^-, \tau^+\}.$$

If $-\tau^- = \tau^+$, this is impossible whenever $q^- \neq q^+$. Hence, we can assume that $-\tau^- \neq \tau^+$ and, to fix the ideas, that $-\tau^- < \tau^+$; then $t_0 < 0$ and

$$x_0(t) = x_0(2t_0 - t), \quad \text{for every } t \in [-t_0 - \omega_0, t_0 + \omega_0].$$

In particular

$$|x_0(-\omega)| = |q^-| = |x_0(2t_0 + \omega)|.$$

Since $|q^-| > K$ is large enough, Lemma 2.1 implies that, defining $r_0(t) = |x_0(t)|$, it holds $\dot{r}_0(-\omega_0) < 0$. Therefore, $\dot{r}_0(2t_0 + \omega_0) > 0$ so that, again in view of Lemma 2.1, $r_0(t) > |q^-|$ for any $t \in (2t_0 + \omega_0, \omega_0]$, contradicting the fact that $r_0(\omega_0) = |q^+| = |q^-|$.

4.4. **Morse index and level estimates.** From now, due to our assumption $q^\pm = R\xi^\pm$, we need to emphasize the dependence on R in our notation. Accordingly, the function u_β as well as the time-interval ω_β appearing in Section 4.1 will be denoted by $u_{\beta,R}$ and $\omega_{\beta,R}$, respectively. Also, with reference to Section 4.2, we will write u_R and ω_R for the limits of $u_{\beta,R}$ and $\omega_{\beta,R}$ as $\beta \to 0^+$, previously denoted by u_0 and ω_0. Finally, $x_R(t) = u_R(t/\omega_R)$ for $t \in [-\omega_R, \omega_R]$ (compare with (48)).

We first prove the Morse index formula (39). Since $u_{\beta,R} \to u_R$ in $\mathcal{C}^2$ (see Remark 4.7), it is easy to see that $\mathrm{j}(d^2\mathcal{M}_0(u_R)) \leq 1$. On the other hand, a straightforward computation shows that

$$d^2\mathcal{M}_0(u_R)[v, v] = \left(\int_{-\omega_R}^{\omega_R} |\dot{x}_R|^2\right) d^2\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R)[y, y] - 4\left(\int_{-\omega_R}^{\omega_R} \nabla V(x_R) \cdot y\right)^2,$$

where $v \in H_0^1([-1, 1])$ and $y(t) = v(t/\omega_R)$ for $t \in [-\omega_R, \omega_R]$. Hence,

$$\mathrm{j}(d^2\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R)) \leq 1,$$

as desired.

Now, we prove the estimate from above in (40). To this end, we first recall the notation in Section 4.1 and we choose an arbitrary $\gamma \in \Lambda_{K\xi^\pm}$. Then, we take $\eta^+ : [1, +\infty) \to [K, +\infty)$ and $\eta^- : (-\infty, -1] \to [K, +\infty)$ as the solutions of the Cauchy problems

$$\dot{\eta}^\pm = \pm\sqrt{2V(\xi^\pm\eta^\pm)}, \qquad \eta^\pm(\pm 1) = K$$

and we define τ_R^+, τ_R^- (for $R > K$) as the unique points such that $\eta^\pm(\tau_R^\pm) = R$. As a next step, we set, for any $s \in \mathbb{S}^1$,

$$\zeta(s)(t) = \begin{cases} \xi^+\eta^+(t) & \text{for } t \in [1, \tau_R^+] \\ \gamma(s)(t) & \text{for } t \in [-1, 1] \\ \xi^-\eta^-(t) & \text{for } t \in [\tau_R^-, -1] \end{cases}$$

and

$$h(s)(t) = \zeta(s)\left(\tau_R^- + \frac{1}{2}(\tau_R^+ - \tau_R^-)(t+1)\right), \qquad \text{for any } t \in [-1, 1],$$

in such a way that $h \in \Lambda_{R\xi^\pm}$. We also set, for any $T > 0$, $x_T(s)(t) = h(s)(t/T)$ for $t \in [-T, T]$. We have, for any $s \in \mathbb{S}^1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\mathcal{M}_0(h(s))} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \inf_{T>0} \mathcal{A}_{[-T,T]}(x_T(s)) \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{\tau_R^-}^{\tau_R^+} \left(\frac{1}{2}|\dot\zeta(s)(t)|^2 + V(\zeta(s)(t))\right) dt \\
&\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{\tau_R^-}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2}|\dot\eta^-(t)|^2 + V(\xi^-\eta^-(t))\right) dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{A}_{[-1,1]}(\gamma(s)) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_1^{\tau_R^+} \left(\frac{1}{2}|\dot\eta^+(t)|^2 + V(\xi^+\eta^+(t))\right) dt \\
&\le M_+ + \int_{-1}^{\tau_R^-} \sqrt{V(\xi^-\eta^-(t))}\dot\eta^-(t)\, dt + \int_1^{\tau_R^+} \sqrt{V(\xi^+\eta^+(t))}\dot\eta^+(t)\, dt \\
&= M_+ + \int_K^R \sqrt{V(\xi^- r)}\, dr + \int_K^R \sqrt{V(\xi^+ r)}\, dr,
\end{aligned}$$

with $M_+ > 0$ a suitable constant not depending on R and s. Now, using (14) we find

$$\sqrt{V(\xi^\pm r)} \le \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{1}{r^{\alpha/2}} + \frac{C_+}{r^{2+\alpha/2}}, \qquad \text{for every } r \ge K,$$

so that, with a simple computation,

$$\sqrt{\mathcal{M}_0(h(s))} \le \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}R^{1-\alpha/2} + M_+ + \frac{4C_+}{2+\alpha}, \qquad \text{for every } s \in \mathbb{S}^1.$$

Recalling the definition of c_0 given in (45), the fact $\mathcal{M}_0(u_R) = c_0$ (compare with (49)) and the well-known relation

$$\sqrt{\mathcal{M}_0(u_R)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R), \tag{53}$$

we infer that

$$\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R) \le \left(\sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}\right) R^{1-\alpha/2} + \sqrt{2}\left(M_+ + \frac{4C_+}{2+\alpha}\right).$$

Therefore, the estimate from above in (40) holds for any

$$M > \sqrt{2}\left(M_+ + \frac{4C_+}{2+\alpha}\right). \tag{54}$$

Finally, we prove the estimate from below in (40). As a first step, we prove that for any $u \in \Gamma_{R\xi^\pm}$ satisfying

$$\min_t |u(t)| \le K \tag{55}$$

it holds that

$$\sqrt{\mathcal{M}_0(u)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}R^{1-\alpha/2} - \frac{4C_+}{2+\alpha} - \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}K^{1-\alpha/2}. \tag{56}$$

To prove this, we first observe that (55) implies the existence of $t_1, t_2 \in (-1,1)$ such that $|u(t_i)| = K$ and $|u(t)| \geq K$ for $t \in [-1,t_1] \cup [t_2,1]$. Now, we introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{L}(u) = \int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}(t)|\sqrt{V(u(t))}\,dt;$$

writing $r(t) = |u(t)|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\mathcal{M}_0(u)} \geq \mathcal{L}(u) &\geq \int_{[-1,t_1]\cup[t_2,1]} |\dot{u}(t)|\sqrt{V(u(t))}\,dt \\ &\geq \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\int_{[-1,t_1]\cup[t_2,1]} |\dot{r}(t)|r^{-\alpha/2}(t)\,dt - C_+\int_{[-1,t_1]\cup[t_2,1]} |\dot{r}(t)|r^{-2-\alpha/2}(t)\,dt,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (14). Now, on one hand

$$\int_{[-1,t_1]\cup[t_2,1]} |\dot{r}(t)|r^{-2-\alpha/2}(t)\,dt = 2\int_K^R r^{-2-\alpha/2}\,dr \leq \frac{4}{\alpha+2}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{-1}^{t_1} |\dot{r}(t)|r^{-\alpha/2}(t)\,dt \geq \inf_{r\in\mathcal{R}}\int_{-1}^{t_1} |\dot{r}(t)|r^{-\alpha/2}(t)\,dt = \frac{2}{2-\alpha}(R^{1-\alpha/2} - K^{1-\alpha/2}),$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \{r \in H^1([-1,t_1]) : r(-1) = R,\, r(t_1) = K\}$, and analogous estimate holds for $\int_{t_2}^{1} |\dot{r}(t)|r^{-\alpha/2}(t)\,dt$. Summing up, (56) is proved.

To conclude, we recall that that for any $h \in \Lambda$, there exists $s_h \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $h(s_h)([-1,1]) \cap [c_1,c_2] \neq \emptyset$ (see 46); in particular, $h(s_h)$ satisfies (55). Hence

$$\sup_{s\in\mathbb{S}^1}\sqrt{\mathcal{M}_0(h(s))} \geq \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}R^{1-\alpha/2} - \frac{4C_+}{2+\alpha} - \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}K^{1-\alpha/2}.$$

Recalling the definition of c_0 given in (45), the fact $\mathcal{M}_0(u_R) = c_0$ (compare with (49)) and (53), we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R) \geq \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}R^{1-\alpha/2} - \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{4C_+}{2+\alpha} + \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}K^{1-\alpha/2}\right).$$

Hence, the estimate from below in (40) holds for any

$$M > \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{4C_+}{2+\alpha} + \sqrt{\frac{m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}K^{1-\alpha/2}\right). \tag{57}$$

Combining (54) and (57), we conclude.

5. Proof of the main result

In this section we prove that the parabolic solutions x_R given by Theorem 4.1 satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, namely, (33), (34) and (35). In this way, we obtain the thesis of Theorem 1.1.

5.1. **Proof of** (35)**.** Of course, we assume here that $\min_t |x_R(t)| < K$ and we take t_R^-, t_R^+ as in (35). Notice that, by Lemma 2.1, $|x_R(t)| \le K$ for any $t \in [t_R^-, t_R^+]$ so that

$$V(x_R(t)) \ge V_K := \inf_{|x|\le K} V(x) > 0, \qquad \text{for every } t \in [t_R^-, t_R^+].$$

Then, using the conservation of the energy we can estimate $\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R) &= \int_{[-\omega_R,t_R^-]\cup[t_R^+,\omega_R]} 2V(x_R(t))\,dt + \int_{[t_R^-,t_R^+]} 2V(x_R(t))\,dt \\ &\ge \int_{[-\omega_R,t_R^-]\cup[t_R^+,\omega_R]} |\dot x_R(t)|\sqrt{V(x_R(t))}\,dt + 2\left(t_R^+ - t_R^-\right) V_K.\end{aligned}$$

Now, arguing as in the proof of (56) we can see that

$$\int_{[-\omega_R,t_R^-]\cup[t_R^+,\omega_R]} |\dot x_R(t)|\sqrt{V(x_R(t))}\,dt \ge \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}R^{1-\alpha/2} - \frac{M}{\sqrt{2}},$$

so that

$$2\left(t_R^+ - t_R^-\right) V_K \le \mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R) - \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}R^{1-\alpha/2} + \frac{M}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Recalling the estimate from above in (40), we conclude.

5.2. **Proof of** (34)**.** By contradiction, assume that, for instance,

$$\delta_R := \min_t |x_R(t) - c_1| = |x_R(\tau_R) - c_1| \to 0^+. \tag{58}$$

Setting $J_R(t) = \frac{1}{2}|x_R(t) - c_1|^2$, we can perform computations analogous to the ones leading to (18) and (19); in particular, writing V as in (6) and using (8), we can easily see that

$$\ddot J_R(t) > 0, \qquad \text{whenever} \quad |x_R(t) - c_1| \le \delta^*.$$

Then, there exist τ_R^-, τ_R^+ such that $\tau_R^- < \tau_R < \tau_R^+$ and

$$|x_R(\tau_R^\pm) - c_1| = \delta^* \quad \text{ and } \quad |x_R(t) - c_1| \le \delta^*, \quad \text{ for any } t \in [\tau_R^-, \tau_R^+];$$

moreover, for $r_R(t) := |x_R(t) - c_1|$ it holds that $\dot r_R(t) < 0$ for $t \in (\tau_R^-, \tau_R)$ and $\dot r_R(t) > 0$ for $t \in (\tau_R, \tau_R^+)$. As a consequence, using the conservation of the energy and (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_R^+ - \tau_R &\ge \int_{\tau_R}^{\tau_R^+} \frac{\dot r_R(t)}{\sqrt{2V(x_R(t))}}\,dt \ge \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{3m_1}}\int_{\tau_R}^{\tau_R^+} \dot r_R(t) r_R(t)^{\alpha/2}\,dt \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{3m_1}}\frac{2}{2+\alpha}\left(\delta_*^{1+\alpha/2} - \delta_R^{1+\alpha/2}\right),\end{aligned}$$

implying that $\tau_R^+ - \tau_R$ is bounded away from zero for R large; of course, the same holds for $\tau_R - \tau_R^-$.

As a next step, we define the function v_R as

$$v_R(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_R}\left(x_R\left(\delta_R^{1+\alpha/2}t + \tau_R\right) - c_1\right), \qquad t \in [-\gamma_R, \sigma_R],$$

where

$$-\gamma_R = \frac{\tau_R^- - \tau_R}{\delta_R^{1+\alpha/2}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma_R = \frac{\tau_R^+ - \tau_R}{\delta_R^{1+\alpha/2}}.$$

Notice that $|v_R(0)| = 1$, $|v_R(t)| \geq 1$ and $|\delta_R v_R(t) + c_1| \leq \delta^*$ for $t \in [-\gamma_R, \sigma_R]$. The function v_R satisfies

$$\ddot{v}_R = -\frac{m_1 v_R}{|v_R|^{\alpha+2}} + \delta_R^{1+\alpha} \nabla \Phi_1(\delta_R v_R + c_1)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot{v}_R|^2 = \frac{m_1}{\alpha |v_R|^\alpha} + \delta_R^\alpha \Phi_1(\delta_R v_R + c_1).$$

Moreover, in view of the above discussion, $-\gamma_R \to -\infty$ and $\sigma_R \to +\infty$. In view of these facts, it is easy to see that $v_R \to v_\infty$ for $R \to +\infty$ in $\mathcal{C}^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R})$, with v_∞ an entire parabolic solution of the problem

$$\ddot{v}_\infty = -\frac{m_1 v_\infty}{|v_\infty|^{\alpha+2}}.$$

We now continue the proof by showing that, as a consequence of the above blow-up analysis,

$$\liminf_{R \to +\infty} \mathrm{j}\left(d^2 \mathcal{A}_{[\tau_R^-, \tau_R^+]}(x_R)\right) \geq i(\alpha), \tag{59}$$

with $i(\alpha)$ defined in (51). Of course, v_∞ is contained in a plane in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (say, $v_\infty(t) \cdot e \equiv 0$, for a suitable $e \in \mathbb{R}^3$); moreover, from [31, Sections 3-4] we know that for $L > 0$ large enough there exist $i(\alpha)$ linearly independent $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{i(\alpha)} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_c((-L, L); \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\int_{-L}^{L} \left(\dot{\varphi}_i^2(t) - \frac{m_1}{\alpha |v_\infty(t)|^{\alpha+2}} \varphi_i^2(t) \right) dt < 0, \qquad i = 1, \dots, i(\alpha). \tag{60}$$

Notice that $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_c((-\gamma_R.\sigma_R); \mathbb{R})$ for R large. We define, for $i = 1, \dots, i(\alpha)$ and $s \in [-\gamma_R, \sigma_R]$,

$$k_i(s) = \varphi_i(s) e$$

and, for $t \in [\tau_R^-, \tau_R^+]$,

$$h_{i,R}(t) = \delta_R \, \varphi_i \left(\frac{t - \tau_R}{\delta_R^{1+\alpha/2}} \right) e.$$

An elementary computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_R^{\alpha/2-1} d^2 \mathcal{A}_{[\tau_R^-, \tau_R^+]}(x_R)[h_{i,R}, h_{i,R}] &= \int_{-\gamma_R}^{\sigma_R} \left(|\dot{k}_{i,R}|^2 + \delta_R^{2+\alpha} D^2 V(\delta_R v_R + c_1)[k_{i,R}, k_{i,R}] \right) \\
&= \int_{-\gamma_R}^{\sigma_R} \left(|\dot{k}_{i,R}|^2 - \frac{m_1}{\alpha |v_R|^{\alpha+2}|} |k_{i,R}|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \int_{-\gamma_R}^{\sigma_R} \left(m_1 \frac{(v_R \cdot k_{i,R})^2}{(\alpha+2)|v_R|^{\alpha+4}} + \delta_R^{2+\alpha} d^2 \Phi_1(\delta_R v_R + c_1)[k_{i,R}, k_{i,R}] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $v_\infty(t) \cdot e \equiv 0$ and passing to the limit, we easily obtain that

$$\lim_{R \to +\infty} \delta_R^{\alpha/2-1} d^2 \mathcal{A}_{[\tau_R^-, \tau_R^+]}(x_R)[h_{i,R}, h_{i,R}] = \int_{-L}^{L} \left(\dot{\varphi}_i^2 - \frac{m_1}{\alpha |v_\infty|^{\alpha+2}} \varphi_i^2 \right)$$

which is negative in view of (60). This gives the desired conclusion (59).

In the case $\alpha > 1$, (59) immediately leads to a contradiction. Indeed, combining (39) together with the easy observation that $\mathrm{j}(d^2 \mathcal{A}_{[\tau_R^-, \tau_R^+]}(x_R)) \leq \mathrm{j}\left(d^2 \mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R, \omega_R]}(x_R)\right)$ yields a contradiction with $i(\alpha) > 1$.

In the case $\alpha = 1$, more work is needed. At first, we observe that, arguing as in the proof of (35) (see Section 35), we can prove that

$$\int_{t_R^-}^{t_R^+} |\dot{x}_R(t)|^2 \le M + \frac{M}{\sqrt{2}},$$

so that, using (35), $\int_{t_R^-}^{t_R^+}(|x_R|^2 + |\dot{x}_R|^2)$ is bounded as well. On the other hand, $|x_R(t_R^\pm)|$, $|\dot{x}_R(t_R^\pm)| = \sqrt{2V(x_R(t_R^\pm))}$ and

$$\|\ddot{x}_R\|_{L^\infty([-\omega_R, t_R^-]\cup[t_R^+,\omega_R])}$$

are also bounded. As a consequence, defining $\tilde{x}_R$ as in (36), we have that there exists a function $x_\infty : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\tilde{x}_R \to x_\infty$ in $H^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R})$ (in particular, uniformly on compact sets). From (58) we deduce that there exists $t_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_\infty(t_\infty) = c_1$; moreover, via a blow-up analysis analogous to the one leading to (59) (and recalling (39)), we see that $x_\infty(t) \notin \Sigma$ for $t \neq t_\infty$. As a consequence, x_∞ is a (one-collision) generalized parabolic solution of (1) and, reasoning as in the proof of Claim 4 in Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\lim_{t\to-\infty} \frac{x_\infty(t)}{|x_\infty(t)|} = \xi^- \neq \xi^+ = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{x_\infty(t)}{|x_\infty(t)|}. \tag{61}$$

On the other hand, we can argue exactly as in Section 4.3 (using regularization techniques) to prove that

$$x_\infty(t) = x_\infty(2t_\infty - t), \qquad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This clearly contradicts (61).

5.3. **Proof of** (33)**.** By contradiction, assume that

$$\rho_R := \min_t |x_R(t)| = |x_R(\tau_R)| \to +\infty.$$

(notice that here τ_R has a different meaning with respect to (58)). In particular, we can always suppose $\rho_R \ge K$; then, Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 are applicable and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_R - \tau_R &\ge \frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}}\left(R^{1+\alpha/2} - \rho_R^{1+\alpha/2}\right), \\ -\omega_R - \tau_R &\ge \frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}}\left(R^{1+\alpha/2} - \rho_R^{1+\alpha/2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Let us set

$$d_R = \frac{\rho_R}{R} \in (0,1], \qquad d = \lim_{R\to+\infty} d_R \in [0,1],$$

and we distinguish two cases.

If $d = 0$, we define

$$v_R(t) = \frac{1}{\rho_R}\left(x_R\left(\rho_R^{1+\alpha/2}t + \tau_R\right)\right), \qquad t \in [-\gamma_R, \sigma_R],$$

where

$$-\gamma_R = \frac{-\omega_R - \tau_R}{\rho_R^{1+\alpha/2}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma_R = \frac{\omega_R - \tau_R}{\rho_R^{1+\alpha/2}}.$$

Notice that $|v_R(0)| = 1$, $1 \leq |v_R(t)| \leq R/\rho_R$ for $t \in [-\gamma_R, \sigma_R]$. Writing V as in (10), the function v_R satisfies

$$\ddot{v}_R = -\frac{m v_R}{|v_R|^{\alpha+2}} + \rho_R^{1+\alpha} \nabla W(\rho_R v_R)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot{v}_R|^2 = \frac{m}{\alpha |v_R|^\alpha} + \rho_R^\alpha W(\rho_R v_R).$$

Moreover, from (62) we obtain

$$\sigma_R = \frac{\omega_R - \tau_R}{\rho_R^{1+\alpha/2}} \geq \frac{1}{(1+\alpha/2)\sqrt{2C_+}} \frac{1 - d_R^{1+\alpha/2}}{d_R^{1+\alpha/2}} \to +\infty$$

and, analogously, $-\gamma_R \to -\infty$. Finally, using (11) we find

$$|\rho_R^{1+\alpha} \nabla W(\rho_R v_R)| \leq \rho_R^{1+\alpha} \frac{C_+}{|\rho_R v_R|^{\alpha+3}} \leq \frac{C_+}{\rho_R^2} \to 0 \tag{63}$$

and

$$|\rho_R^{\alpha} W(\rho_R v_R)| \leq \rho_R^{\alpha} \frac{C_+}{|\rho_R v_R|^{\alpha+2}} \leq \frac{C_+}{\rho_R^2} \to 0 \tag{64}$$

for $R \to +\infty$, uniformly in t. We can thus readily see that $v_R \to v_\infty$ in $\mathcal{C}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, with v_∞ an entire parabolic solution of the problem

$$\ddot{v}_\infty = -\frac{m v_\infty}{|v_\infty|^{\alpha+2}}.$$

Moreover, following the arguments used in the proof of Claim 4 in Proposition 3.1, we also have

$$\lim_{t \to -\infty} \frac{v_\infty(t)}{|v_\infty(t)|} = \xi^- \neq \xi^+ = \lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{v_\infty(t)}{|v_\infty(t)|}$$

This immediately gives a contradiction in the case $\alpha = 1$, since, as well-known, the asymptotic directions of parabolic solutions of the Kepler problem must coincide (cf. Proposition 6.1). On the other hand, for $\alpha > 1$ we can argue as in Section 5.2 (using this time (63) and (64) to pass to the limit) to prove that

$$\liminf_{R \to +\infty} \mathrm{j}\left(d^2 \mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R, \omega_R]}(x_R)\right) \geq i(\alpha)$$

and thus contradicting (39) since $i(\alpha) \geq 2$ for $\alpha > 1$.

We now focus on the case $d \in (0, 1]$. Let us define

$$\tilde{v}_R(t) = \frac{1}{R}\left(x_R\left(R^{1+\alpha/2} t + \tau_R\right)\right), \qquad t \in [-\tilde{\gamma}_R, \tilde{\sigma}_R],$$

where

$$-\tilde{\gamma}_R = \frac{-\omega_R - \tau_R}{R^{1+\alpha/2}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{\sigma}_R = \frac{\omega_R - \tau_R}{R^{1+\alpha/2}}.$$

The function $\tilde{v}_R$ satisfies

$$\ddot{\tilde{v}}_R = -\frac{m \tilde{v}_R}{|\tilde{v}_R|^{\alpha+2}} + R^{1+\alpha} \nabla W(R \tilde{v}_R)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot{\tilde{v}}_R|^2 = \frac{m}{\alpha |\tilde{v}_R|^\alpha} + R^\alpha W(R \tilde{v}_R).$$

Moreover, $|\tilde v_R(0)| = d_R$, $\tilde v_R(-\tilde\gamma_R) = \xi^-$, $\tilde v_R(\tilde\sigma_R) = \xi^+$ and $d_R \le |\tilde v_R(t)| \le 1$ for $t \in [-\tilde\gamma_R, \tilde\sigma_R]$. Finally, similarly as in (63) and (64),

$$|R^{1+\alpha}\nabla W(R\tilde v_R)| \le \frac{C_+}{R^2}\left(\frac{2}{d}\right)^{\alpha+2}, \qquad |R^\alpha W(R\tilde v_R)| \le \frac{C_+}{R^2} \le \frac{C_+}{R^2}\left(\frac{2}{d}\right)^{\alpha+3} \tag{65}$$

for R large enough.

We now claim that $\tilde\sigma_R + \tilde\gamma_R$ is bounded away from zero. Indeed, if $\tilde\sigma_R \to 0^+$ and $-\tilde\gamma_R \to 0^-$, then from

$$\xi^+ = \tilde v_R(\tilde\sigma_R) = \tilde v_R(0) + \int_0^{\tilde\sigma_R} \dot{\tilde v}_R(t)\,dt \tag{66}$$

and

$$\xi^- = \tilde v_R(-\tilde\gamma_R) = \tilde v_R(0) + \int_{-\tilde\gamma_R}^0 \dot{\tilde v}_R(t)\,dt, \tag{67}$$

together with the fact that $\max_t |\dot{\tilde v}_R(t)|$ is bounded in R in view of (65), we obtain $\tilde v_R(0) \to \xi^+$ and $\tilde v_R(0) \to \xi^-$, which is not possible since $\xi^+ \neq \xi^-$.

As a consequence, there exists a nontrivial interval $\tilde I_\infty = [-\tilde\gamma_\infty, \tilde\sigma_\infty]$ such that $\tilde v_R \to \tilde v_\infty$ in $\mathcal{C}^2_{\rm loc}(\tilde I_\infty)$; moreover, $d \le |\tilde v_\infty(t)| \le 1$ for $t \in \tilde I_\infty$ and $\tilde v_\infty$ is a parabolic solution of

$$\ddot{\tilde v}_\infty = -\frac{m\tilde v_\infty}{|\tilde v_\infty|^{\alpha+2}}. \tag{68}$$

This is possible only if $\tilde I_\infty$ is a compact interval (compare with the discussion before Proposition 6.1); as a consequence, the $\mathcal{C}^2_{\rm loc}$ convergence actually reduces to the $\mathcal{C}^2$ one. Summing up, and passing to the limit in (66) and (67), $\tilde v_\infty$ is a parabolic solution of the (free-time) fixed-endpoints problem

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{\tilde v}_\infty = -\dfrac{m\tilde v_\infty}{|\tilde v_\infty|^{\alpha+2}} \\ \tilde v_\infty(T_1) = \xi^-,\ \tilde v_\infty(T_2) = \xi^+ \end{cases}$$

with $T_1 = -\tilde\gamma_\infty$ and $T_2 = \tilde\sigma_\infty$.

Now, using the fact that x_R has zero energy, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R) &= \int_{-\omega_R}^{\omega_R} 2V(x_R(t))\,dt = 2R^{1+\alpha/2}\int_{-\tilde\sigma_R}^{\tilde\gamma_R} V(R\tilde v_R(s))\,ds \\ &= 2R^{1-\alpha/2}\int_{-\tilde\sigma_R}^{\tilde\gamma_R}\left(\frac{m}{\alpha|\tilde v_R(s)|^\alpha} + R^\alpha W(R\tilde v_R(s))\right)ds \end{aligned}$$

so that, using (65),

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty}\frac{\mathcal{A}_{[-\omega_R,\omega_R]}(x_R)}{R^{1-\alpha/2}} = 2\int_{-\tilde\sigma_\infty}^{\tilde\gamma_\infty}\frac{m}{\alpha|\tilde v_\infty(s)|^\alpha}\,ds.$$

Using Proposition 6.2

$$\int_{-\tilde\sigma_\infty}^{\tilde\gamma_\infty}\frac{m}{\alpha|\tilde v_\infty(s)|^\alpha}\,ds = \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,m}_{[-\tilde\gamma_\infty,\tilde\sigma_\infty]}(\tilde v_\infty) < \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha},$$

so that a contradiction with (40) is obtained.

Remark 5.1. When $\xi^+ = \xi^-$, the arguments developed along the paper can be adapted to prove the existence of a generalized (see Section 4.2) spatial parabolic solutions of (1) satisfying (2) (for $\xi^+ = \xi^-$).

Indeed, we first observe that a variant of Theorem 4.1 can be proved for $\xi^+ = \xi^-$, giving the existence of a generalized parabolic solution of (38) satisfying the level estimate (40). This can be done via an approximation argument for $\xi_n^+ \to \xi^+$ and $\xi_n^- \to \xi^-$ (with $\xi_n^- \neq \xi_n^-$), the convergence for $n \to +\infty$ of the corresponding solution coming from (40) (with some care, it is possible to see that the constant M can be chosen independently on n).

Second, we pass to the limit $R \to +\infty$ following the steps in the proof of Proposition 3.1. Minor variants are needed, since just $H^1_{\rm loc}$ convergence is possible near the collision instants; however, a careful use of the action estimate (40) allows us to obtain the conclusion. We leave the details to the reader for the sake of briefness.

6. Appendix: the α-homogeneous problem

In this final section we collect some useful results about parabolic solutions of the α-homogeneous problem

$$\ddot{x} = -\frac{\mu x}{|x|^{\alpha+2}}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}, \tag{69}$$

where $\mu > 0$ and $\alpha \in [1, 2)$. Of course, the term *parabolic* is here meant with respect to the natural energy associated to (69), namely x is a parabolic solution of (69) if $\frac{1}{2}|\dot{x}(t)|^2 = \frac{\mu}{\alpha|x(t)|^\alpha}$.

It is well-known that any solution to (69) is contained in a plane; therefore, without loss of generality we assume that $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and we use polar coordinates

$$x(t) = r(t)e^{i\theta(t)}, \qquad r(t) > 0.$$

Recall also that any solution $x : I \to \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ (with $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ interval) to (69) has constant angular momentum, that is (in polar coordinates)

$$r^2(t)\dot{\theta}(t) \equiv c, \qquad t \in I, \quad \text{for some } c \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{70}$$

In particular, either the function $t \mapsto \theta(t)$ is constant ($c = 0$) or it is strictly monotone ($c \neq 0$). Combining (70) with the fact that x has zero energy, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\dot{r}^2(t) = \frac{\mu}{\alpha r^\alpha(t)} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{c^2}{r^2(t)}, \qquad t \in I. \tag{71}$$

Finally, the Lagrange-Jacobi identity (compare with (21)) reads as

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\left(\frac{1}{2}r^2(t)\right) = \frac{(2-\alpha)\mu}{\alpha r^\alpha(t)}, \qquad t \in I. \tag{72}$$

The case of parabolic solutions with zero angular momentum is easily discussed. Indeed, by integrating (71) for $c = 0$ we find that the only solutions are of the type

$$x(t) = \gamma_{\alpha,\mu}(t - t_0)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}} e^{i\theta_0}, \qquad t \in I = (t_0, +\infty),$$

$$x(t) = \gamma_{\alpha,\mu}(t_0 - t)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}} e^{i\theta_0}, \qquad t \in I = (-\infty, t_0),$$

for $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\theta_0 \in [0, 2\pi)$, where

$$\gamma_{\alpha,\mu} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2\alpha}}(2+\alpha)\right)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}$$

as already defined in (26). In particular, there are no entire rectilinear parabolic solutions of (69).

From now, we thus consider the case of solutions with non-zero angular momentum. First, we deal with entire parabolic solutions to (69). From the Lagrange-Jacobi identity (72) we deduce that there exists $t_* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\dot r(t) < 0$ for $t < t_*$ and $\dot r(t) > 0$ for $t > t_*$; moreover, $r(t) \to +\infty$ for $|t| \to +\infty$ (compare with [3, Lemma 7.6]). We also have the following.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $x : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ be a parabolic solution of (69) (with angular momentum $c \neq 0$). Then*

$$r(t) \sim \gamma_{\alpha,\mu} |t|^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}, \qquad |t| \to +\infty, \tag{73}$$

and the limits $\theta(\pm\infty) := \lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \theta(t)$ satisfy

$$|\theta(+\infty) - \theta(-\infty)| = \frac{2\pi}{2-\alpha}. \tag{74}$$

We observe that the asymptotic estimate (73) follows from (25); however, in this simpler setting we can provide a slightly more direct proof. We also notice that, for $\alpha = 1$, (74) gives $|\theta(+\infty) - \theta(-\infty)| = 2\pi$, according to the fact that $t \mapsto x(t) = r(t)e^{i\theta(t)}$ parameterizes a parabola in the plane. On the other hand, for $\alpha > 1$, i) and ii) imply that $x(t)$ is a self-intersecting planar path, with exactly

$$i_*(\alpha) = \max\left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \,:\, k < \frac{1}{2-\alpha} \right\}$$

self-intersection. Notice that this quantity is strictly related to the constant $i(\alpha)$ defined in (51).

Proof. We define the function

$$\Gamma(t) = r^\alpha(t)\dot r^2(t).$$

Using (71) we obtain

$$\Gamma(t) = \frac{2\mu}{\alpha} - c^2 r^{\alpha-2}(t),$$

so that

$$\lim_{|t|\to+\infty} \Gamma(t) = \frac{2\mu}{\alpha}.$$

Hence $r^{\alpha/2}(t)\dot r(t) \to \pm\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}}$ for $t \to \pm\infty$ and we obtain the asymptotic estimate for r using de l'Hopital rule.

To prove (74), we assume (to fix the ideas) that $\dot\theta(t) > 0$ and let $r_* = r(t_*)$. Using (70) and (71), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(+\infty) - \theta(t_*) &= c\int_{t_*}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{r^2(t)} = c\int_{t_*}^{\infty} \frac{\dot r(t)}{r^2(t)\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\alpha r^\alpha(t)} - \frac{c^2}{r^2(t)}}}\, dt \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{1}{r_*}} \frac{d\xi}{\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\alpha c^2}\xi^\alpha - \xi^2}} = \frac{2}{2-\alpha}\int_0^{r_*^{(\alpha-2)/2}} \frac{d\eta}{\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\alpha c^2} - \eta^2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used the change of variable $\xi = \eta^{2/(2-\alpha)}$. From (71) with $t = t_*$ we find $r_*^{\alpha-2} = \frac{2\mu}{\alpha c^2}$, so that

$$\int_0^{r_*^{(\alpha-2)/2}} \frac{d\eta}{\sqrt{\frac{2m}{\alpha c^2} - \eta^2}} = \frac{\pi}{2}$$

and, therefore,

$$\theta(+\infty) - \theta(t_*) = \frac{\pi}{2-\alpha}.$$

Evaluating in an analogous way $\theta(t_*) - \theta(-\infty)$, we conclude. □

We now look for parabolic solutions of the (free-time) fixed-endpoints problem

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{x} = -\dfrac{\mu x}{|x|^{\alpha+2}} \\ x(T_1) = x_1, \quad x(T_2) = x_2, \end{cases} \tag{75}$$

where $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Our aim is to prove the following result.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be such that $x_1 \neq x_2$ and $|x_1| = |x_2| = 1$. If x is a parabolic solution of problem* (75)*, then*

$$\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\mu}_{[T_1,T_2]}(x) < \sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}} \frac{4}{2-\alpha},$$

where $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\mu}_{[T_1,T_2]}(x) = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left(\frac{1}{2}|\dot{x}|^2 + \frac{\mu}{\alpha|x|^\alpha} \right)$ is the action functional associated with (69)*.*

The proof of Proposition 6.2 will be based on the fact that solutions of problem (75) can be classified according to their homotopy class in the punctured plane $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. Precisely, defining the rotation index $\mathrm{Rot}_{[T_1,T_2]}(x)$ of the path $t \mapsto x(t) = r(t)e^{i\theta(t)}$ as

$$\mathrm{Rot}_{[T_1,T_2]}(x) = \frac{\theta(T_2) - \theta(T_1)}{2\pi},$$

it is clear that any solution of (75) satisfies

$$\mathrm{Rot}_{[T_1,T_2]}(x) = \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2\pi} + l \tag{76}$$

for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $x_i = e^{i\theta_i}$, $\theta_i \in [0, 2\pi)$, $i = 1, 2$.

An existence and uniqueness result for parabolic solutions of (75) with prescribed rotation index is given in the Proposition below.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be such that $x_1 \neq x_2$ and $|x_1| = |x_2| = 1$ and let $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, problem* (75) *has a parabolic solution satisfying* (76) *if and only if*

$$|\theta_2 - \theta_1 + 2\pi l| < \frac{2\pi}{2-\alpha} \tag{77}$$

and, in this case, the solution is unique (up to a time-translation).

Based on this, we can give a proof of Proposition 6.2.

Proof of Proposition 6.3. Assume that x_* is a parabolic solution (75). Then, x_* satisfies (76) for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and, in view of Proposition 6.3, l fulfills (77). Define

$$\tilde{K}_l = \left\{ u \in H^1([-1,1]; \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) : \begin{array}{l} u(-1) = x_1,\ u(1) = x_2 \\ \mathrm{Rot}_{[-1,1]}(u) = \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{2\pi} + l \end{array} \right\}$$

and let K_l be the closure of $\tilde{K}_l$ in the weak topology of H^1. We consider the minimization problem

$$\min_{u\in K_l} \mathcal{I}(u) \tag{78}$$

where $\mathcal{I}(u) = \int_{-1}^{1} |\dot{u}|^2 \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{\mu}{\alpha|u|^\alpha}$ is the zero-energy Maupertuis functional associated to (69) (we assume throughout this proof that the reader is familiar with the theory of the Maupertuis functional, as described for instance in [25, Appendix B]). It is easy to see (compare with Lemma 4.2) that the minimization problem (78) has a solution. The crucial point is that, since l satisfies (77), we know from [25, Corollary 1.11] that any minimum pont is collision-free and, hence, belongs to $\tilde{K}_l$. Therefore, a suitable rescaling solves problem (75). By the uniqueness property in Proposition 6.3, we conclude that the minimization problem (78) has a unique solution u_* which is nothing but a rescaling of x_*. In particular,

$$\mathcal{I}(u_*) < \mathcal{I}(u), \qquad \text{for any } u \in K_l.$$

Now, on one hand $\mathcal{I}(u_*) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\mu}_{[T_1,T_2]}(x_*)\right)^2$ (compare with (53)). On the other hand, defining

$$u(t) = \begin{cases} (-t)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}\, x_1 & \text{if } t \in [-1,0] \\ t^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}\, x_2 & \text{if } t \in [0,1] \end{cases}$$

it is easy to see that $u \in K_l$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}}\frac{4}{2-\alpha}\right)^2,$$

concluding the proof. □

We conclude the section by proving Proposition 6.3.

Proof of Proposition 6.3. The fact that condition (77) is necessary follows from (74), recalling the fact that, for a (non-rectilinear) parabolic solution $x(t) = e^{i\theta(t)}$, the function $t \mapsto \theta(t)$ is strictly monotone. We now focus on the existence and uniqueness of a parabolic solution of (75)-(76) when (77) is satisfied; without loss of generality, we will also take $T_1 = -T$ and $T_2 = T$, with $T > 0$ to be determined.

At first, we observe that $x : [-T, T] \to \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is a parabolic solution of (75) with angular momentum equal to c (see (70)) if and only if

$$y(t) = \frac{1}{|c|^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}}\, x\left(|c|^{\frac{\alpha+2}{2-\alpha}}\, t\right), \qquad 0 \le |t| \le T_c := |c|^{-\frac{\alpha+2}{2-\alpha}}\, T,$$

is a parabolic solution of

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{y} = -\dfrac{\mu y}{|y|^{\alpha+2}} \\ y(-T_c) = \dfrac{e^{i\theta_1}}{|c|^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}}, \quad y(T_c) = \dfrac{e^{i\theta_2}}{|c|^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}}, \end{cases} \tag{79}$$

with angular momentum equal to $\mathrm{sgn}(c)$; moreover, $\mathrm{Rot}_{[-T,T]}(x) = \mathrm{Rot}_{[-T_c,T_c]}(y)$. Passing to polar coordinates $y(t) = \rho(t)e^{i\varphi(t)}$, with $\varphi(-T_c) = \theta_1$, it is easy to see

that this is equivalent to the equations

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\dot{\rho}^2 + F(\rho) = 0, & F(\rho) = \dfrac{\mu}{\alpha\rho^\alpha} - \dfrac{1}{2\rho^2}, \\ \dot{\varphi} = \dfrac{\operatorname{sgn}(c)}{\rho^2}, \end{cases} \tag{80}$$

together with the boundary conditions

$$\rho(-T_c) = \rho(T_c) = \frac{1}{|c|^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}} \tag{81}$$

and

$$\varphi(T_c) = \theta_2 + 2\pi l. \tag{82}$$

Let us define

$$\rho_* = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{2-\alpha}},$$

that is, ρ_* is the unique point such that $F(\rho_*) = 0$. A simple phase-plane argument shows that there exists a unique solution ρ_* of the first-order differential equation $\frac{1}{2}\dot{\rho}^2 + F(\rho) = 0$ satisfying $\rho_*(0) = \rho_*$; moreover, ρ_* is an even function defined on the whole real line. Hence, we easily see that the first equation in (80) has a solution ρ_c satisfying the boundary condition (81) if and only if

$$c^2 < \frac{2\mu}{\alpha}.$$

In this case, $\rho_c(t) = \rho_*(t)$ for $t \in [-T_c, T_c]$, where

$$T_c = \sqrt{2}\int_{\rho_*}^{1/|c|^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{-F(r)}}. \tag{83}$$

On the other hand, integrating the second equation and imposing the boundary condition (82) we obtain

$$\Theta(c) = \theta_2 - \theta_1 + 2\pi l, \tag{84}$$

where we have set

$$\Theta(c) = \operatorname{sgn}(c)\int_{-T_c}^{T_c} \frac{ds}{\rho_*^2(s)} = 2\operatorname{sgn}(c)\int_0^{T_c} \frac{ds}{\rho_*^2(s)}, \qquad c \in \left(-\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}, \frac{2\mu}{\alpha}\right) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Now, recalling (83) we immediately see that Θ is strictly decreasing on $\left(-\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}, 0\right)$ and on $\left(0, \frac{2\mu}{\alpha}\right)$, with

$$\lim_{c \to \pm\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}} \Theta(c) = 0.$$

On the other hand, $T_c \to +\infty$ for $c \to 0$ and

$$\lim_{c \to 0^\pm} \Theta(c) = \pm 2\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{ds}{\rho_*^2(s)} = \pm\frac{2\pi}{2-\alpha}$$

as already shown along the proof of (74). Hence, (84) is uniquely solvable if and only if $0 \neq |\theta_2 - \theta_1 + 2\pi l| < \frac{2\pi}{2-\alpha}$, which is precisely the assumption (77) (notice that $\theta_2 - \theta_1 + 2\pi l \neq 0$ since $x_1 \neq x_2$). □

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti and V. Coti Zelati, Periodic solutions of singular Lagrangian systems, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications **10**, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA (1993)

[2] A. Bahri and P.H. Rabinowitz, *A minimax method for a class of Hamiltonian systems with singular potentials*, J. Funct. Anal. **82** (1989), 412–428.

[3] V. Barutello, S. Terracini and G. Verzini, *Entire parabolic trajectories as minimal phase transitions*, Calc. Var. **49** (2014), 391–429.

[4] V. Barutello, S. Terracini and G. Verzini, *Entire minimal parabolic trajectories: the planar anisotropic Kepler problem*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **207**, (2013), 583–609.

[5] S.V. Bolotin, *Nonintegrability of the problem of n centers for $n > 2$* (Russian), Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. (1984), 65–68.

[6] S.V. Bolotin and P. Negrini, *Chaotic behavior in the 3-center problem*, J. Differential Equations **190** (2003), 539–558.

[7] S.V. Bolotin and P. Negrini, *Regularization and topological entropy for the spatial n-center problem*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **21** (2001), 383–399.

[8] R. Castelli, *On the variational approach to the one and N-centre problem with weak forces*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Milano-Bicocca, 2009.

[9] K.-C. Chen, *Existence and minimizing properties of retrograde orbits to the three-body problem with various choices of masses*, Ann. of Math. (2) **167** (2008), 325-348.

[10] K.-C Chen and Y. Yu *Syzygy sequences of the N-center problem*, Preprint 2015.

[11] L. Dimare, *Chaotic quasi-collision trajectories in the 3-centre problem*, Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom. **107** (2010), 427–449.

[12] H.R. Dullin and R. Montgomery, *Syzygies in the two center problem*, Preprint 2015 (arXiv:1509.05220).

[13] P. Felmer and K. Tanaka, *Hyperbolic-like solutions for singular Hamiltonian systems*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **7** (2000), 43–65.

[14] P. Felmer and K. Tanaka, *Scattering solutions for planar singular Hamiltonian systems via minimization*, Adv. Differential Equations **5** (2000), 1519–1544.

[15] G. Fusco, G.F. Gronchi and P. Negrini, *Platonic polyhedra, topological constraints and periodic solutions of the classical N-body problem*, Invent. Math. **185** (2011), 283–332.

[16] A Granas and J. Dugundji, Fixed point theory, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York (2003).

[17] C. Greco, *Periodic solutions of a class of singular Hamiltonian systems*, Nonlinear Anal. **12** (1988), 259–269.

[18] M. Klein and A. Knauf, Chaotic motion in Coulombic potentials, Mathematical physics, X (Leipzig, 1991), Springer, Berlin (1992).

[19] A. Knauf, *The n-centre problem of celestial mechanics for large energies*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **4** (2002), 1–114.

[20] A. da Luz and E. Maderna, *On the free time minimizers of the Newtonian N-body problem*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **156** (2014), 209–227.

[21] E. Maderna, *On weak KAM theory for N-body problems*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **32** (2012), 1019–1041.

[22] E. Maderna and A. Venturelli, *Globally minimizing parabolic motions in the Newtonian N-body problem*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **194** (2009), 283–313.

[23] C. Marchal, *How the method of minimization of action avoids singularities*, Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom. **83** (2002), 325–353.

[24] N. Soave and S. Terracini, *Symbolic dynamics for the N-centre problem at negative energies*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **32** (2012), 3245–3301.

[25] N. Soave and S. Terracini, *Avoiding collisions under topological constraints in variational problems coming from celestial mechanics*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. **14** (2013), 457–501.

[26] H.J. Sperling, *The collision singularity in a perturbed two-body problem*, Celestial Mech. **1** (1969/1970), 213–221.

[27] M. Struwe, Variational methods, A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics **34**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2008)

[28] K. Tanaka, *A note on generalized solutions of singular Hamiltonian systems*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **122** (1994), 275–284.

[29] K. Tanaka, *A prescribed energy problem for a singular Hamiltonian system with a weak force*, J. Funct. Anal. **113** (1993), 351–390.
[30] K. Tanaka, *Morse indices at critical points related to the symmetric mountain pass theorem and applications*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **14** (1989), 99–128.
[31] K. Tanaka, *Noncollision solutions for a second order singular Hamiltonian system with weak force*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **10** (1993), 215–238.
[32] S. Terracini and A. Venturelli, *Symmetric trajectories for the $2N$-body problem with equal masses*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **184** (2007), 465–493.
[33] E.T. Whittaker, *A treatise on the analytical dynamics of particles and rigid bodies: With an introduction to the problem of three bodies*, 4th ed. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1959.

Alberto Boscaggin, Walter Dambrosio and Susanna Terracini
Dipartimento di Matematica "Giuseppe Peano",
Università di Torino,
Via Carlo Alberto, 10, 10123 Torino, Italy
E-mail address: alberto.boscaggin@unito.it
E-mail address: walter.dambrosio@unito.it
E-mail address: susanna.terracini@unito.it